HISTORIC DOCUMENTS OF THE MUSLIM FREEDOM MOVEMENT

JAMIL-UD-DIN AHMED

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

OF THE

MUSLIM FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Compiled by

JAMIL-UD-DIN AHMAD

PUBLISHERS UNITED LTD
176 Anarkali, Lahore

Printed by Sh. Mohammad Amin at the Publishers United Printing Press, 9, Rattigan Road, Lahore, and published by him for the Publishers United Ltd., 176, Anarkali, Lahore

PREFACE

The emergence of Pakistan as a sovereign state on ideological basis has been an event of extraordinary significance in contemporary history. Of late, there have been welcome signs of growing interest in the study of the events, factors and forces pestaining to the Muslim Freedom Movement in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. This movement was not, as wrongly supposed in certain quarters, an off-shoot or a side-growth of any other movement. The Muslim struggle for freedom had a goal and course of its own and as time passed its contours became clearer.

Unfortunately the documents concerning the Muslim Freedom Movement which later took the form of Pakistan Movement have so far lain scattered. This is particularly true of the earlier phase of the movement. An attempt has been made to collect these documents from available sources and collate them, as far as possible, in chronological order. Here and there certain statements made by British authorities and Hindu leaders having a bearing on the Muslim movement have also been included.

The idea behind this collection is to present, in a compendious form, source material, which would be of interest and use to all students of Muslim political history in the sub-continent. This is an indispensable requirement for any rational and objective construction of the history of the Muslim people's struggle for "a place in the seen". It is hoped that this book of documents will be helpful in this behalf.

Rawalpindi,
1970.

Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad.

Contents

1

Syed Ahmad Khan's Statements and Speeches

(*i*) *Conversation on the Subject of Urdu with a British officer, 1867*

In1867, some Hindu leaders of Benares resolved that, as far as possible, the use of the Urdu language, written in Persian script, should be discontinued in Government Courts and should be replaced by the Hindi language written in Devanagiri script. Sir Syed used to say that this was the first occasion when he felt that it was now impossible for the Hindus and the Muslims to progress as a single nation and for anyone to work for both of them simultaneously. His words were: "During these days when the Hindi-Urdu controversy was going on in Benares, one day I met Mr Shakespeare who was posted there as Divisional Commissioner. I was saying something about the education of Muslims, and Mr Shakespeare was listening with an expression of amazement, when, at length, he said, 'This is the first occasion when I have heard you speaking about the progress of the Muslims alone. Before this you were always keen about the welfare of your countrymen in general.' I said, 'Now I am convinced that both these nations will not join wholeheartedly in anything. At present there is no open hostility between the two nations, but on account of the so-called educated people, it will increase immensely in future. He who lives will see.' Mr Shakespeare thereupon said, 'I would be sorry if your prophecy were to prove true.' I said, 'I am also extremely sorry, but I am confident about the accuracy of this prophecy'."

(*ii*) *Extracts from Syed Ahmad Khan's Report to the Committee for Diffusion and Advancement of Learning among the Mussalmans of India, 1872*

Syed Ahmad Khan Bahadur was of opinion that the points now before the Committee, on which the members were to report, did not imply that they should consider and determine upon such means only which might suit the present age, and which might now be practicable. He thought that the Committee

was required rather to consider the means which, quite irrespective of the existing circumstances, might be of real use to Muhammadans in the future. They should look forward to, and inaugurate an educational system for future generations, and although such a system could not possibly be brought into working order all at once, they could consider the fabric as a whole and commence such portions of it as are at present feasible. Every member of the Committee, he said, must be aware that education cannot always be one and the same, nor is it possible that any large community should have always only one particular end in view; the different classes constituting a large community having always different objects and pursuits. The system of education under the consideration of the Committee relates to a very large community, and the different classes composing that community have their distinct objects as regards education. They had, therefore, to inaugurate such a scheme of education as would embrace the various wants and requirements of those different classes of the people. Of the classes constituting the Muhammadan community there is, he said, one which aspires to high situations in the service of Government, to have a share in the management of the country, to gain honour and respect in the world, and thus to do good to their fellowmen. There is another which does not aspire to Government posts, but prefers rather to live by commerce or by some profession. The third lives to improve their estates and property, to manage their affairs systematically, and to live in a manner suitable to their station in life. The fourth seeks a knowledge of arts and sciences. The fifth has no inclination for any of the above objects, but with a view to their life hereafter wishes to gain a perfect knowledge of the religious sciences, and to pass their days in the study of the same. There are lastly the lower classes for whose general good, instruction to a certain extent is necessary. These different classes, however, have all a common desire that their children may not learn to disbelieve in their religion, and may not neglect to discharge fully the duties of their faith. Thus, when they had to consider and determine upon a system of education for the whole Muhammadan community, they should determine upon such a scheme which answer all their aforesaid wants, as well as other purposes pertaining to education.

Without great personal exertions on the part of the Muhammadan community, Syed Ahmad Khan observed, such a system can never be successfully inaugurated and carried out in its entirety. It is a moral impossibility that it can be effected by Government. The system of education for the Muhammadans should, therefore, consist of two branches: One for their general

education which may be available for all classes of the community, from the highest to the lowest, which may answer all their wants, and in the accomplishment of which no help should be expected from Government. In the second branch, the Committee have to consider such means as may enable the Muhammadan community to benefit by the rules and principles of education adopted by Government until it is ready to adopt the plan proposed in the first branch. Syed Ahmad Khan Bahadur said that he was about to say that which would doubtless prove distasteful to the majority of the members present, but as he considered it his duty to speak what he deemed to be the truth, he had no alternative but to do so. When the question of education is mooted, he said, "amongst the Muhammadans, their efforts are always hampered by their endeavours to adopt their old hereditary system of education, and the old establised course of study. Many schools regulated by the old system have been established by the Muhammadans of Jounpore, Allygurh, Cawnpore, Saharanpore, Deoband, Delhi and Lahore, but he could assure the Committee that they are altogether useless to the nation at large, and that no good can be expected from them."

The times, and the spirit of the age, the Sciences and the results of those Sciences, have all been altered. The old Muhammadan books and the tone of their writings do not teach the followers of Islam independence of thought, perspecuity and simplicity; nor do they enable them to arrive at the truth of matters in general; on the contrary, they deceive and teach men to veil their meaning, to embellish their speech with fine words, to describe things wrongly and in irrelevant terms, to flatter with false praise, to live in a state of bondage, to puff themselves up with pride, haughtiness, vanity and self-conceit, to hate their fellow creatures, to have no sympathy with them, to speak with exaggeration, to leave the history of the past uncertain and to relate facts like tales and stories. All these things are quite unsuited to the present age and to the spirit of the time, and thus instead of doing any good they do much harm to the Muhammadans. Loss of time in a useless pursuit is a loss which can hardly be retrieved. He hoped, therefore, that his respected fellow members would excuse him, and would consider the points he had just dwelt upon, when determining the new system of education, which was, he trusted, to be of much benefit to their country.

(iii) *Extracts from the address presented to Lord Lytton at the foundation-stone-laying ceremony of the M.A.O. College, Aligarh, January 8, 1877*

No nation can ever become truly civilised till it takes upon itself the all important, though difficult, task of self-education. We may go even further and say that the greatest efforts on the part of the Government in matters of this kind must more or less depend for their success on the support which they receive from the people. From the very outset it has, we believe, been the object and desire of our rulers that, while they on their part lent all possible support and countenance, the people of this country should ultimately learn to take into their own hands the management of national education.

So different in many respects are our educational wants from those of the rest of the population of India, that the best measures which the Government can adopt, consistently with its policy, must still be inadequate; and even if it were not opposed to the wise policy ef Government to interfere in matters of religion, it would be beyond its powers to remove difficulties which owe their strength to religious ideas, and will only yield to theological discussion. The Government could neither introduce a system of religious instruction, nor could it direct its efforts towards contending with the prejudices of a race by whom religion is regarded not merely a matter of abstract belief, but also as the ultimate guide in the most ordinary secular concerns of life. The treatment which the question of Muhammadan education has in this respect received at the hands of the Government, is fully appreciated by us, and leaves no room for any kind of dissatisfaction or complaint.

Recognising the difficulties which had thus prevented the Government educational system from fully exercising its beneficial effects upon the intellectual and moral condition of our community, a few of its more advanced members determined to establish a college upon principles which should meet the wishes and supply the educational wants of the members of our faith. The Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College Fund Committee was accordingly formed to carry out this object. Their endeavours had at first to encounter a very formidable opposition from the bulk of the Mussalman community—an opposition due to the same cause that had kept Muhammadans away from the Government colleges and schools throughout the country. But the supporters of the new movement met this opposition with firmness and patience, and their efforts have been crowned with

a large measure of success. The opposition, at one time so dangerous, is gradually dying away, and the promoters of the scheme may well be proud that their endeavours have reached the stage at which your Excellency finds them today.

The college, of which your Excellency is about to lay the foundation-stone, differs in many important respects from all other educational institutions which this country has seen. There have before been schools and colleges founded and endowed by private individuals. There have been others built by sovereigns and supported by the revenues of the State. But this is the first time in the history of the Muhammadans of India that a college owes its establishment, not to the charity or love of learning of an individual, nor to the splendid patronage of a monarch, but to the combined wishes and the united efforts of a whole community. It has its origin in causes which the history of this country has never witnessed before. It is based upon principles of toleration and progress such as find no parellel in the annals of the East. To dispel these illusory traditions of the past which have hindered our progress; to remove those prejudice which have hitherto exercised a baneful influence on our race; to reconcile oriental learning with Western literature and science; to inspire in the dreamy minds of the people of the East the practical energy which belongs to those of the West; to make the Mussalmans of India worthy and useful subjects of the British Crown; to inspire in them that loyalty which springs, not from servile submission to a foreign rule, but from genuine appreciation of the blessing of good government—these are the objects which the founders of the college have prominently in view. And looking at the difficulties which stood in our way, and the success which has already been achieved, we do not doubt that we shall continue to receive, even in large measure, both from the English Government and from our own countrymen, that liberal support which has furthered our scheme, so that from the seed which we sow today there may spring up a mighty tree, whose branches, like those of the banyan of the soil, shall in their turn strike firm roots into the earth, and themselves send forth new and vigorous saplings; that this college may expand into a university, whose sons shall go forth, throughout the length and breadth of the land, to preach the gospel of free inquiry, of large-hearted toleration and of pure morality.

(*iv*) *Speech on Lord Ripon's Local Self-Government Bill, January 15, 1883*

India by itself is a continent in which large numbers of

people belonging to different nations and religions live. The severity of religious laws has so far kept even neighbours apart and the caste system is prevalent in all its rigour. It is possible that there may be people of different religions and sects in the same district. One group of inhabitants may be wealthy and engaged in business; the other may be enlightened and prestigious. It is also possible that one group may be numerically larger than the other, and one section of people might have attained a level of enlightenment much higher than the level of other sections. One community may be fully aware of the need of inclusion of its members in Local Boards and District Councils and the other community may be totally indifferent to it. Thus, it cannot perhaps be denied that the setting up of representative institutions in India will create great difficulties and social and political dangers.

In a country like England where communal distinctions now do not exist and where growth of tolerance has toned down the differences and cleavages in religious matters, such difficulties do not arise in regard to elections. Due to unification of religion and nationality the British have become a nation, and educational progress has rendered insignificant the minor differences in so far as matters affecting the welfare of the country as a whole are concerned. Christians have no objection to voting for Jews to represent their interests in Parliament. So far as social and political objects are concerned, it can be said that the whole population of England constitutes a nation. Doubtless it is clear that this cannot be said of India. The appointment of members through elections means the representation of the opinion and interests of a section of the population. In countries whose population is composed of one nation and one religion this is, indeed, the best method that can be adopted. But, my lord, in a country like India, where caste distinctions still flourish, where there is no fusion of the various races, where religious distinctions are still violent, where eudcation in its modern sense has not made an equal or proportionate progress among all the sections of the population, I am convinced that the introduction of the principle of election, pure and simple, for representation of various interests on the Local Boards and District Councils would be attended with evils of greater significance than purely economic considerations. So long as differences of race and creed and the distinction of caste form an important element in the socio-political life of India and influence her inhabitants in matters connected with the administration and welfare of the country at large, the system of election, pure and simple, cannot safely be adopted. The larger

community would totally override the interests of the smaller community, and the ignorant public would hold Government responsible for introducing measures which might make the differences of race and creed more violent than ever.

(v) *Speech on the Indian National Congress at the session of the All-India Muslim Educational Conference, Lucknow, December 28, 1887*

The Congress has made many submissions to the Government. . . .The first outcry is that when the East India Company's rule ended and the Queen Empress assumed sovereignity, Parliament passed a law to the effect that all subjects, white or coloured, European or any other, are equal and are entitled to employment. The demand made in the current agitation is that the competitive examination held in England should be discontinued and it should be held in India. Besides this, it is also desired that non-covenanted posts too should be filled through competition. It means that the posts above the rank of Tehsildar such as Sub-Judge, Munsif, Deputy Collector, Extra Assistant Commissioner, should all be filled up through competition. . . .

Let us see what is the principle underlying the system of competitive examination in any country and whether our country is prepared for this procedure. It is not a very intricate problem of political economy. Everyone can understand that the competitive system best suits the country which is populated by one nation and all the people from a Duke to a cobbler belong to a nation. To introduce the competitive examination among them does not create any difficulties, for whether a man becomes a plaintiff or an official, no one can resent it. The other possibility is that there may be different nationalities in a country but they might have fused into a nation, for instance, England and Scotland. They are different nationalities. They have fought many battles and have displayed great gallantry. But those days are gone, and no one now can say that the inhabitants of England and Scotland do not constitute a nation. But the condition of our country in which different nationalities live is different. There are Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, etc. Even among the Hindus those of north-western India are different from those of Bengal and Deccan. If you think that these nationalities have come so close to one another that they could be regarded as one nation, I would readily agree that there should be competitive examination in India. But if it is not so, our country is not fit for competitive examination. A third possibility is that there may be different nationalities in a country but they may be on the

same level as regards ability, education and wealth, and every nationality may have the opportunity of taking equal advantage of the competitive examination. Now the question is whether the Muslims' education, training and knowledge of English literature, necessary for high Government posts, are of the same order as those of the Hindus. Certainly not. When this state of affairs exists how can the competitive examination be introduced in this country?. . . . .

The second demand is that members of the Viceroy's Council should be elected by the people. They want that the House of Lords and the House of Commons should be copied in India. Members, who are elected, should constitute a body like the House of Commons and the Government Officials together with the Viceroy should constitute the House of Lords. In England, it is the rule that no law can be enforced unless it is jointly approved by the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Let us imagine that the Viceroy's Council is formed in the manner desired, i.e. members are elected by the people. And let us suppose that all Muslims vote for a Muslim candidate and all Hindus vote for a Hindu. Now count how many votes the Muslim candidate will get and how many the Hindu. It is certain that the Hindu candidate will have four times as many, because their population is four times as numerous. Thus how can the Mussulman hold his own against the Hindu. It will be like a game of dice in which one man has four dice and the other only one. . . . .

I am not a conservative. I am a great liberal. But it is not wise to disregard the real interests of the nation. I was the man who opposed the plan for elections, pure and simple. If it be not considered a boast on my part, I can say that Lord Dufferin's views (on the question of elections to Local Boards) were changed by my speech, and Government retain the power to nominate one-third of the members, and two-thirds were allowed to be elected. Now let us see what results the elections have produced. In no district are Hindus and Muslims equal in number. Recently in Calcutta a venerable Muslim gentleman belonging to a good family told me that eighteen members were to be elected in his city but not one Muslim was elected and all elected members were Hindus. The same is true of other cities.

(*vi*) *Speech at Meerut, March 16, 1888*

It is never our object to oppose a community or people who want to make progress and who have attained the status they desire and for which they are fit. But our Bengali friends

have tried to impose on our people in an improper and unfair way. It is our duty to expose this high-handedness and to protect our nation from its injurious effects. It is wrong to think that we are bent upon opposing our Bengali friends; our only desire is to explain to our people what appears to us to be in their interest . . . . In some districts pressure was brought to bear on the Muslims to join the Congress. They did not make any approach to those who are influential and are Raises (nobles) and regarded as leaders of the Muslims, but pressure was put on persons who could be imposed upon. In some districts they came under Government's pressure; in some other districts they were told that unless they joined they would not be able to carry on their work or they themselves thought that they would not be able to earn their livelihood unless they joined. The Congress leaders did not hesitate even to offer bribes. Who does not know that three or four Muslims from the North-Western Province attended the Congress? They were hired men. They were taken to Madras and there, it was given out that they were Nawabzadas, they were Raises of such and such district, they were big bosses among the Muslims; although everyone knows that they were purchased. We know very well those members of our community who have been bought over through pressure, through their foolishness, through their lust for publicity or through their poverty. If some Rais joins hands with them of his own accord we do not care. The loss of one man will not weaken our group. But the attempt to misrepresent the will of our nation by misstating facts and by giving it out that someone is a Rais or Nawab of such and such district and to show that the Muslims are associated with them amounts to improper interference with our nation.

I want to show that except for Mr Badruddin Taiyebji, who is a venerable gentleman and whom I hold in high esteem, no other leading Muslim took part in the Congress. But I think he made a mistake. He has written two letters to me, one of which was written after the publication of my Lucknow speech. I think he wishes to be informed as to what are the matters discussed in the Congress which are considered against the Muslims, so that he might get them excluded from discussion in the Congress. As a matter of fact, all matters discussed in the Congress do not suit our nation. However, supposing Mr Badruddin Taiyebji's views are opposed to our views, his opinion cannot be treated as the opinion of the nation and his agreement with the Congress cannot be regarded as agreement of the whole nation . . . . If our Bengali friends had not adopted this wrong course we would not have felt concerned in any way with the

Congress or its members or the improper demands for which they are agitating. We shall be pleased, if the members of the Congress become the stars of the heaven or the sun; but when they attempt to wean away a few members of our community by disgraceful methods of pressure and allurement and show to the world that the Muslim nation is with them, it is incumbent on us to repel such attempts. . . . .

The course we should adopt is to keep aloof from this political agitation. Let us think over our position. We are deficient in knowledge, high education and wealth. Thus, we should try to promote education among our people. . . .When you have acquired education and true education has penetrated into your heart you will yourself think of those rights which you can legitimately obtain from the British Government. As a result of it you will hold honoured posts in the Government. To associate with Bengalis in these undesirable political affairs at present would prove injurious.

(*vii*) *Reply to Hindu leaders, February 1888*

But when our Hindu brethren or Bengali friends wish to make a move which involves humiliation for our nation, we certainly cannot remain friendly. It is undoubtedly our duty to protect our nation from the moves of the Hindus and Bengalis which, we feel sure, are calculated to injure our nation. Undoubtedly our people are in an abyss of misery. But if our Bengali friends want to trample underfoot this fallen nation they should not expect that we will submit. They should remember that we are like a rope which has been burnt but its coil is not burnt, it is still there. The rope is not yet quite cold. There is some heat left in it. They should touch it carefully, lest the hand gets burnt. The Congress, in fact, represents a civil war without arms. The civil war decides who will wield authority. The object of the Congress is to have the British Government only in name in India but the internal government of the country should pass into their hands. They do not openly mention their own name, but they know well that the Muslims are not fit to run the administration, hence the internal government will come into their hands.

We too like civil war but not one without arms. If Government is willing to transfer the internal government, we would request that it should first pass a law of competition, and the internal government should be placed in the hands of the nation which comes out successful in this competitive examination. But the Government should allow the use of a different kind

of pen, the pen which our forefathers wielded and which is, indeed, the pen needed for carrying on the Government of the country! Then whoever succeeds should govern the country. If our Bengali friends pass the test, we will certainly be prepared to place their shoes on our heads. But without such a civil war, we would not like to see our nation being trampled under their feet. Our Hindu and Bengali countrymen should understand that it is our earnest desire to see all the nations of India living in amity and friendship, but such friendship is possible only so long as no one makes an attempt to dominate the other. Bengalis and the other educated Hindus have made this move and yet they expect the Muslims to join them. This is impossible and inconceivable.

(viii) Reply to Mr Badruddin Taiyebji
February, 1888

In the first instance, I object to the word "delegate". I assure my friend that the Muslims who went from our province and Oudh to attend the Congress at Madras do not deserve the appellation "delegate". The Muslims who went there were not elected even by ten Muslims. . . . The unanimous passing of any resolution in the Congress does not make it a National Congress. A Congress becomes a National Congress only when all the aims and objects of the nation whom that Congress represents are common without any exception. My honourable friend admits that some aims and objects of the Muslims and the Hindus are different and contradictory. Should we Muslims found a separate Congress to realise our different aims? Should the two Congresses compete and even fight with each other in view of their conflicting and antagonistic aims. Our friend should himself decide in all fairness whether such nations whose aims and objects are opposed to one another, though some minor points might be common, can form a National Congress. It may be appropriate or not, but no Muslim, be he a cobbler or a nobleman, would ever agree to the Muslims being relegated to a status where they become slaves of another nation which is their neighbour, even though time has reduced them to a very low position and will reduce them still further.

Let my friend, Mr Badruddin Taiyebji, leaving aside the minor questions common to Hindus and Muslims (because there is nothing in the world which does not share some features in common with others, so much so that even pigs and men have certain common features), tell me whether there is any basic political question which can be brought before the Congress and

is not detrimental to the Muslims. The most important question is election to the Viceroy's Council on which much stress was laid in the Congress session under the presidentship of our friend, Mr Taiyebji. I have proved in my speech at Lucknow that whichever mode of election is adopted the number of Hindus will be four times that of Muslims, they will be successful, the Government of the whole country will be in the hands of Bengalis or other Hindus like Bengalis, and the Muslims will be in a miserable position. Many people condemned me for my Lucknow speech, but no one, not even Mr Taiyebji, replied to it. The demands of the Bengalis may be justifiable or not, but we cannot tolerate our nation being hurled into this misery and degradation, and at least we cannot participate in matters which bring humiliation to our nation. What happened in the Mutiny? The Hindus started it. The Muslims were restless. They jumped into the fray. The Hindus took a bath in the Ganges and went scotfree, but the Muslims and their families were ruined. The same would be the result of the Muslims' participation in political agitation.

(*ix*) *Extracts from article contributed to the Pioneer, Allahabad, 1883*

Long before the idea of founding the Indian National Congress was mooted, I had given thought to the matter whether representative government is suited to the conditions of India. I studied John Stuart Mill's views in support of representative government. He has dealt with this matter exceedingly well in great detail. I reached the conclusion that the first prerequisite of a representative government is that the voters should possess the highest degree of homogeneity. In a form of government which depends for its functioning upon majorities it is necessary that the people should have no differences in the matter of nationality, religion, ways of living, customs, morals, culture and historical traditions. These things should be common among people to enable them to run a representative government properly. Only when such homogeneity is present can representative government work or prove beneficial. It should not even be thought of when those conditions do not exist.

In a country like India where homogeneity does not exist in any one of these fields, the introduction of representative government cannot produce any beneficial results; it can only result in disturbing the peace and prosperity of the land. I sincerely hope that whichever party comes into power in Great

Britain—be they Conservatives, Liberals, Unionists or Radicals—they will remember that India is a continent; it is not a small and homogeneous country like England, Scotland, Wales or Ireland. India is inhabited by different peoples, each one of whom is numerically large and different from others in culture, in moral code, in social organization, in political outlook, in religion, in physique and in historical associations. These people have never been united since the downfall of the Muslim Empire.

Instead of being able to organise some other form of government they have just indulged in mutual fighting and internecine wars . . . . All the difficulties with which Ireland has been faced are due to the fact that the British are the rulers and the Irish are the ruled . . . . and yet it cannot be denied that there is great resemblance between the two; they have the same complexion, their religions are not so different; they can inter-marry; their cultures and modes are similar. These are the conditions on which a democratic Government can rest.

The aims and objects of the Indian National Congress are based upon ignorance of history and present-day realities; they do not take into consideration that India is inhabited by different nationalities; they presuppose that the Muslims like the Maharttas, the Brahmins, the Kshatriyas, the Banias, the Sikhs, the Bengalis, the Madrasis and the Peshawaris can all be treated alike and all of them belong to the same nation. The Congress thinks that they profess the same religion, that they speak the same language, that their ways of life and customs are the same, that their attitude to history, is similar and is based upon the same historical traditions. . . . For the successful running of a democratic government it is essential that the majorities should have the ability to govern not only themselves but also unwilling minorities . . . I consider the experiment which the Indian National Congress wishes to make fraught with danger and suffering for all the nationalities of India, especially Muslims. The Muslims are a minority, but they are a highly united minority. At least traditionally they are prone to take the sword in hand when the majority oppresses them. If this happens it will bring about disasters greater than the ones which came in the wake of the happenings of 1857 . . . . My belief that homogeneity among the people is the prerequisite of the successful working of democratic government is evident from the fact that when the rules and regulations of the Governing Body of the M.A.O. College, Aligarh, were being framed,

I took great care to ensure that the Trustees of the College, who would control its administration, should all be Muslims. . . The Congress, cannot rationally prove its claim to represent the opinions, ideals and aspirations of the Muslims.

(*x*) *Extract from Memorandum of Muhammadan Defence Association, Aligarh, December 1893*

The real object of representation is that the elected person should represent the electors. Under the present conditions the voters for elections to the legislative councils too are largely Hindus. Thus if the Hindus are legally obliged to elect Muslim members, such Muslim members would represent their electors and not the Muslims. In fact, it is quite obvious that this would not provide true representation to the Muslim community, because there would be thousands of Muslims who would be holding different political opinions, and the Hindu voters, if they are intelligent, would elect only those Muslims whose views are identical with or similar to their (Hindu voters) views. The Muslims would thus realise that their so-called representatives, who really owe their election to the Hindus, are supporting policies which the Muslims as a whole disapprove . . . . The elementary principles of election demand that Muslim members should be elected by Muslim electorate and Hindu members by Hindu electorate . . . . This can be easily arranged by making a rule according to which, in a particular election, the Hindu members of Municipal Committee should elect a Hindu member and in another election the Muslim members of Municipal Committees should elect a Muslim member. The same principle should be adopted in the election of members of the Imperial Legislative Council.

2

Mr Badruddin Taiyebji's Letter to Mr A.O. Hume, 1888

My own view is that the friction and bitterness which are caused by this Congress agitation every year outweigh the advantages to be gained. The prime object of the Congress was to unite the different communities and provinces into one and then promote harmony. The contrary has occurred. Not only have the Mussalmans been divided from the Hindus in a manner they never were before, but the Mussalmans themselves

have been split into two factions, the gulf between whom is becoming wider and wider every day. The fact exists and whether we like it or not, we must base our proceedings upon the fact that an over-whelming majority of Mussalmans is against the movement. If then the Mussalman community as a whole is against the Congress, it follows that the movement *ipso facto* ceases to be a general or National Congress.

3

Extracts from the Government of India's Resolution of July 15, 1885 on the memorial submitted by the Central National Muhammadan Association

In February 1882 a memorial was addressed to His Excellency the late Viceroy by the National Muhammadan Association to the present decayed position of Muhammadan in India, to the causes which had, in the opinion of the memoralists, led to the decadence, and to the circumstances which in their belief, tend to perpetuate that condition. . . .

The memorial of the National Muhammadan Association lays special stress upon the extent to which the Hindus have ousted Muhammadans from State employ generally, and prays that "the balance of State patronage may be redressed".

The memorialists are aware of the orders which have from time to time been issued by the Government of India as well as by the Local Governments, directing the Heads of Departments to pay due regard to the claims of candidates belonging to their community, but at the same time they assert that no practical gain has accrued to the Muhammadans from these orders. This they attribute to two causes—(1) neglect of the Government policy by the officers with whom the actual distribution and dispensation of State patronage rests, and (2) the undue importance which is attached to a university qualification.

With regard to this point, the Government of India would remark that in every province, admission to the superior departments of the Government service is now, speaking generally, regulated either by public competition or by the possession of qualifications altogether independent of the race or caste of the candidate. If, therefore, Muhammadans have secured a less proportion of places in the public service than members of other

native communities in India, the blame cannot, in the opinion of he Government of India, be attributed in any sensible degree to the action of the State or of its officers. In the matter of the Statutory Civil Service, the Muhammadans have in fact had even more than their proportionate share of consideration, 10 out of 36 nominations to that service having been given to Mussalmans.

From the reports of the Local Governments it would appear, moreover, that the memorialists have exaggerated the numerical inferiority of Muhammadans in the public service generally. In Madras and Bombay, where Muhammadans form only 6 to 7 per cent of the total population, the anxiety of these Governments to induce the Mussalman community to qualify for the public service has been distinctly manifested in the special educational facilities afforded to members of that community. Not only so, but Mussalman candidates, provided they are qualified by the prescribed tests for the public service, have always received exceptional favour. In Madras, this has been specially the case since the time of Lord Hobart's Government in 1872. The Government of Bombay pointed out that in Western India, the Muhammadans chances of employment are better now than they were in the days of the Hindu dynasties which preceded the British Empire. If the proportion of Muhammadans in the public service of Bombay is small, the reason is, in the opinion of the Government of Bombay, to be found, not in any disfavour to Muhammadans entertained by English bestowers of patronage, nor in the overpowering influence of Hindu advisers and subordinates, for the Government and its higher officers are fully alive to the administrative advantage of associating men of different races in every department of public business, but in the circumstance that entrance into the public service is determined as far as possible by educational tests, "whereby public emoluments are treated as public property, and the public is served by the fittest persons." In Sind, where the proportion of Muhammadans to the total population is considerable, the reports show that the community is very largely represented in most departments of the public service.

In Bengal, to which the memorial more particularly refers, the Muhammadans form over 31 per cent of the total population. Here it is, no doubt, true that their numerical inferiority in the public offices is very marked. This is, however, mainly due to their want of the prescribed educational qualifications, especially as regards a knowledge of English. For this deficiency poverty will to some extent account; but there is also no doubt

that there has been a real unwillingness to take advantage of the education provided by the State. At the same time another important fact, pointed out by Nawab Abdul Latif in a memorandum laid before the Education Commission, should not be overlooked, viz., that "the mass of the Muhammadan population consists of cultivators among some millions of Brahmins and Kayasthas, who from time immemorial have enjoyed a superior system of education and in consequence a passport to public offices." This is specially the case in Eastern Bengal, where the Muhammadans are most numerous.

In the North-Western Provinces and Oudh and in the Punjab, the enquiries which have been instituted prove that the allegations of the memorialists as to the exclusion of their community from a share of Government patronage, do not apply. The figures submitted indicate that in respect of offices in the Subordinate Executive and Judicial services, including all the higher and better paid appointments, the Muhammadans have secured not only a fair proportion, but almost an unduly liberal share of patronage. In the Central Provinces they have been equally fortunate. Nor in the minor Administrations does there appear to exist any cause of grievance under this head.

The Governor-General-in-Council does not consider it desirable or for the advantage of the Muhammadans themselves that they should be exempted from those tests which are established to secure the admission of duly qualified candidates into the public service. Nor can special favour be shown them in open competitive examinations of any description. It is only by raising their own educational qualifications to the level already attained by other races that the Muhammadans can hope to win appointments that are awarded as the result of examinations. But there are a large number of appointments, the gift of which lies in the hands of the Local Governments, the High Courts, or local officers. The Governor-General-in-Council desires that in those provinces where Muhammadans do not receive their full share of State employment, the Local Governments and High Courts will endeavour to redress this inequality as opportunity offers, and will impress upon subordinate officers the importance of attending to this in their selection of candidates for appointments of the class last referred to. . . .

4

Nawab Mohsinual Mulik's Statement Regarding Syed Ahmad Khan's Political Attitude

Though Syed Ahmed Khan held the view that the Muslims' greatest need was higher education and they should make all possible effort to acquire it, yet he was not oblivious of the fact that Muslims as a nation had some special needs which in most respects were different from and in some respects contrary to those of other nations of this country; also the Muslims on account of their inadequate education and unfamiliarity with English literature and English political principles were less capable of protecting their rights and objects, and it is therefore, necessary to devise some special method for the defence of their rights and national aims. He, therefore, pondered deeply on this question and also consulted such persons, as were competent to express opinion on this delicate problem. Ultimately he proposed on the December 30, 1893 that a Committee be formed for the defence of the political rights of the Muslims.

5

Extracts from Address presented by Muslim Leaders to the Viceroy, Lord Minto, October 1, 1906

One of the most important characteristics of British policy in India, is the increasing reference that has, so far as possible, been paid from the first to the views and wishes of the people of the country in matters affecting their interests, with due regard always to the diversity of race and religion which forms such an important feature of all Indian problems.

Beginning with the confidential and unobtrusive method of consulting influential members of important communities in different parts of the country, this principle was gradually extended by the recognition of the right of recognised political or commercial organisations to communicate to the authorities, their criticisms and views on measures of public importance, and finally by the nomination and election of direct repesentatives of the people in Municipalities, district boards and above all in the Legislative Chambers of the country. This last element is, we understand, about to be dealt with by the committee appointed by your Excellency, with the view of giving it further extension, and it

is with reference mainly to our claim to a fair share in such extended representation and some other matters of importance affecting the interests of our community, that we have ventured to approach your Excellency on the present occasion.

The Mohammadans of India number according to the census taken in the year 1901 over sixty-two millions, or between one-fifth and one-fourth of the total popoulation of his Majesty's Indian dominions, and if a reduction be made for the uncivilised portions of the community enumerated under the heads of animists and other minor religions, as well as for those classes who are ordinarily classified as Hindus, but properly speaking are not Hindus at all, the proportion of Mohammadans to the Hindu majority becomes mush larger. We, therefore, desire to submit that under any system of representation, extended or limited, a community in itself more numerous than the entire population of any first class European Power, except Russia, may justly lay claim to adequate recognition as an important factor in the State.

We venture indeed, with your Excellency's permission to go a step further and urge that the position accorded to the Mohammadan community in any kind of representation, direct or indirect, and in all other ways affecting their status and influence should be commensurate not merely with their numerical strength but also with their political importance and the value of the contribution which they make to the defence of the Empire, and we also hope that your Excellency will in this connection be pleased to give due consideration to the position which they occupied in India, a little more than a hundred years ago, and of which the traditions have naturally not faded from their minds....

While, therefore, we are bound to acknowledge with gratitude that such representation as the Mohammadans of India have hitherto enjoyed has been due to a sense of justice and fairness on the part of your Excellency and your illustrious predecessors in office or the heads of local governments by whom the Mohammadan members of Legislative Chambers have almost without exception been nominated, we cannot help observing that the representation thus accorded to us has necessarily been inadequate to our requirements, and has not always carried with it the approval of those whom the nominees were selected to represent....

As for the results of election, it is most unlikely that the name of any Mohammadan candidate will ever be submitted for

the approval of Government by the electoral bodies as now constituted, unless he is in sympathy with the majority in all matters of importance, nor can we in fairness find fault with the desire of our non-Moslem fellow subjects to take full advantage of their strength and vote only for members of their own community or for persons who, if not Hindus, are expected to vote with the Hindu Majority on whose goodwill they would have to depend for their future re-election. It is true that we have many and important interests in common with our Hindu fellow-countrymen, and it will always be a matter of the utmost satisfaction to us as to see these interests safe-guarded, by the presence in our Legislative Chambers of able supporters of these interests, irrespective of their nationality. Still it cannot be denied that we Mohammadans are a distinct community, with additional interests of our own which are not shared by other communities, and these have hitherto suffered from the fact that they have not been adequately represented even in the provinces in which the Mohammadans constitute a distinct majority of the population. . . .

We, therefore, pray the Government will be graciously pleased to provide that both in the gazetted and the subordinate and Ministerial services of all Indian Provinces a due proportion of Mohammadans shall always find place. Orders of like import have at times been issued by Local Governments in some Provinces, but have not, unfortunately, in all cases been strictly observed, on the ground that qualified Mohammadans were not forthcoming. This allegation, however, well founded it may have been at one time, is, we submit, no longer tenable now.

We venture to submit that the generality of Mohammadans in all parts of India feel aggrieved that Mohammadan Judges are not more frequently appointed to the High Courts and Chief Courts of Judicature. Since the creation of these Courts, only three Mohammadan lawyers have held these honourable appointments, all of whom have fully justified their elevation to the bench. At the present movement there is not a single Mohammadan Judge sitting on the bench of any of these Courts, while there are three Hindu Judges in the Calcutta High Court, where the proportion of Mohammadans in the population is very large; and two in the Chief Court of the Punjab, where the Mohammadans form the majority of the population. . . .

As Municipal and District Boards have to deal with important local interests, affecting to a great extent the health, comfort, educational needs, and even the religious concerns of the inhabitants, we shall, we hope, be pardoned if we solicit

for a moment, your Excellency's attention to the position of Mohammadans thereon, before passing to higher concerns. Those institutions form, as it were, the initial rungs in the ladder of self-government and it is here that the principle of representation is brought home intimately to the intelligence of the people. The position of Mohammadans on these Boards is not at present regulated by any guiding principle capable of general application, and practice varies indifferent localities. The Aligarh Municipality, for example, is divided into six wards, and each ward returns one Hindu and one Mohammadan commissioner, and the same principle, we understand, is adopted in a number of municipalities in the Punjab, and elsewhere, but in a good many places the Mohammadan taxpayers are not adequately represented. We would, therefore, respectfully suggest that the Local Authority should in every case be required to declare the number of Hindus and Mohammadans entitled to seats on Municipal and District Boards. Such proportion to be determined in accordance with the numerical strength, social status, local influence, and special requirements of either community. Once their relative proportion is authoritatively determined, we would suggest that either community should be allowed severally to return their own representatives, as is the practice in many towns in the Punjab.

We would also suggest that the Senates and Syndicates of Indian Universities might be similarly dealt with. That is to say, there should so far as possible, be an authoritative declaration of the proportion in which Mohammadans are entitled to be represented in either body.

We now proceed to the consideration of the question of our representation in the Legislative Chambers of the country. Beginning with the Provincial Councils, we would most respectfully suggest that as in the case of Municipalities and District Boards, the proporation of Mohammadan representatives entitled to seats should be determited, and declared with due regard to the important considerations which we have ventured to point out in paragraph five of this address and that the important Mohammadan landowners, lawyers, merchants and representatives of other important interests, the Mohammadans members of District Boards and Municipalities, and the Mohammadan graduates of Universities of a certain standing, say five years, should be formed into electoral Colleges, and be authorised, in accordance with such rules of procedure, as your Excellency's Government may be pleased to prescribe in that behalf, to return the number of members that may be declared to be eligible.

With regard to the Imperial Legislative Council, whereby the due representation of Mohammadan interests is a matter of vital importance, we crave leave to suggest:

(1) That in the cadre of the Council the proportion of Mohammadan representatives should be determined on the basis of the numerical strength of the community, and that in any case, the Mohammadan representatives should never be an ineffective minority.

(2) That, as far as possible, appointment by election should be given preference over nomination. That for purposes of choosing Mohammadan members, Mohammadan landowners, lawyers, merchants, and representatives of other important interests of a status to be subsequently determined by your Excellency's Government, Mohammadan members of the Provincial Councils and Mohammadan Fellows of Universities should be invested with electoral powers to be exercised in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by your Excellency's Government in that behalf.

An impression has lately been gaining ground that one or more Indian members may be appointed on the Executive Council of the Viceroy. In the event of such appointments being made, we beg that the claims of Mohammadans in that connection may not be overlooked. More than one Mohammadan, we venture to say, will be found in the country fit to serve with distinction in that august chamber.

We beg to approach your Excellency on a subject which most closely affects our national welfare. We are convinced that our aspiration as a community, and our future progress are largely dependent on the foundation of a Mohammadan University, which will be the centre of our religious and intellectual life., We therefore, most respectfully pray that your Excellency will take steps to help us in an undertaking in which our community is so deeply interested. . . .

6

Lord Minto's Reply to Muslim Deputation's Address, October 1, 1906

I welcome the representative character of your deputation as expressing the views and aspirations of the enlightened Muslim community of India. I feel that all you have said emanates from a representative body basing its opinions on a

matured consideration of the existing political conditions of India, totally apart from the small personal or political sympathies and antipathies of scattered localities, and I am grateful to you for the opportunity you are affording me of expressing my appreciation of the just aims of the followers of Islam and their determination to share in the political history of our Empire.

As your Viceroy, I am proud of the recognition you express of the benefits conferred by British rule on the diverse races of many creeds who go to form the population of this huge continent. You yourselves, the descendants of a conquering and ruling race, have told me today of your gratitude for the personal freedom, the liberty of worship, the general peace and the hopeful future which British administration has secured for India.

Is it interesting to look back on early British efforts to assist the Mohammedan population to qualify themselves for the public service. In 1782, Warren Hastings founded the Calcutta Madrassah with the intention of enabling its students to compete on more equal terms with the Hindus for employment under Government. In 1811, my ancestor, Lord Minto, advocated improvements in the Madrassah and the establishment of Mohammedan Colleges at other places throughout India. In later years, the efforts of the Mohammedan Association led to the Government resolution of 1885 dealing with the educational position of the Mohammedan community and their employment in the public service, whilst Mohammedan educational effort has culminated in the College of Aligarh, that great institution which the noble and broadminded devotion of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan has dedicated to his co-religionists.

It was in January 1877, that Lord Lytton laid the foundation-stone of Aligarh College, when Sir Syed Ahmed Khan addressed these memorable words to the Viceroy: "The personal honour which you have done me assures me of a great fact and fills me with feelings of a much higher nature than mere personal gratitude. I am assured that you, who upon this occasion represent the British rule, have sympathies with our labours and this assurance is very valuable and a source of great happiness. At my time of life, it is a comfort to me to feel that the undertaking which has been for many years, and is now the sole object of my life, has roused on the one hand the energies of my own countrymen, and on the other hand won the sympathy of our British fellow-subjects and the support of our rulers, so that when the few years I may still be spared are over, and when I

shall be no longer amongst you, the College will still prosper and succeed in educating my countrymen to have the same affection for their country, the same feelings of loyalty for the British rule, the same appreciation of its blessings, the same sincerity of friendship with our British fellow subjects as have been the ruling feelings of my life".

Aligarh has won its laurels. Its students have gone forth to fight the battle of life strong in the tenets of their own religion, strong in the precepts of loyalty and patriotism, and now when there is much that is critical in the political future of India, the inspiration of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and the teachings of Aligarh shine forth brilliantly in the pride of Mohammaden history, in the loyalty, common-sense and sound reasoning so eloquently expressed in your address. But, gentlemen, you go on to tell me that sincere as your belief is in the justice and fair dealings of your rulers, you cannot but be aware that "recent events" have stirred up feelings amongst the younger generation of Mohammadans which might "pass beyond the control of temperate counsel and sober guidance."

Now I have no intention of entering into any discussion upon the affair of Eastern Bengal and Assam, yet I hope that, without offence to anyone, I may thank the Mohammaden community of the new Province for the moderation and self-restraint they have shown under conditions which were new to them, and as to which there has been inevitably much misunderstanding, and that I may at the same time sympathise with all that is sincere in Bengali sentiments. But above all, what I would ask you to believe is that the course the Viceroy and the Government of India have pursued in connection with the affairs of the new Province, the future of which is now, I hope, assured, has been dictated solely by a regard for what has appeared best for its present and future population as a whole, irrespective of race and creed, and that the Mohammadan community of Eastern Bengal and Assam can rely as firmly as ever on British justice and fair-play for the appreciation of its loyalty and the safeguarding of its interests.

You have addressed me, gentlemen, at a time when the political atmosphere is full of change. We all feel, it would be foolish to attempt to deny its existence, hopes and ambitions new to India are making themselves felt. We cannot ignore them—we should be wrong to wish to do so—but to what is all this unrest due? Not to the discontent of misgoverned millions—I defy anyone honestly to assert that—not to say uprising of a disaffected people.

It is due to that educational growth in which only a very small portion of the population has as yet shared, of which British rule first sowed the seed and the fruits of which British rule is now doing its best to foster and to direct. There may be many tares in the harvest we are now reaping. The Western grain which we have sown may not be entirely suitable to the requirements of the people of India, but the educational harvest will increase as years go on, and the healthiness of the nourishment it gives will depend on the careful administration and distribution of its products. You need not ask my pardon, gentlemen, for telling me that "Representative institutions of the European type are entirely new to the people of India" or that their introduction here requires the most earnest thought and care. I should be very far from welcoming all the political machinery of the Western world amongst the hereditary instincts and traditions of Eastern races. Western breadth of thought, the teachings of Western civilisation, the freedom of British individuality can do much for the people of India, but I recognise with you that they must not carry with them an impracticable insistence of the acceptance of political methods.

And now, gentlemen, I come to your own position in respect to the political future of the position of the Mohammedan community for whom you speak. You will, I feel sure, recognise that it is impossible for me to follow you through any detailed consideration of the conditions and the share that the community has a right to claim in the administration of public affairs. I can at present only deal with generalities. The points which you have raised are before the Committee, which, as you know, I have lately appointed to consider the question of representation, and I will take care that your address is submitted to them, but at the same time, I hope, I may be able to reply to the general tenor of your remarks without in any way forestalling the Committee's report.

The pith of your address, as I understand it, is a claim that in any system of representation whether it affects a Municipality, a District Board or a Legislative Council, in which it is proposed to introduce or increase an electoral organisation, the Mohammedan community should be represented as a community. You point out that in many cases electoral bodies, as now constituted, cannot be expected to return a Mohammedan candidate, and that if by chance they did so, it could only be at the sacrifice of such a candidate's view to those of a majority opposed to his own community whom he would in no way represent, and you justly claim that your numerical strength, both in respect to the

political importance of your community and the service it has rendered to the Empire entitle you to consideration. I am entirely in accord with you. Please do not misunderstand me. I make no attempt to indicate by what means the representation of communities can be obtained, but I am as firmly convinced, as I believe you to be, that any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievous failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement, regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities composing the population of this Continent. The great mass of the people of India have no knowledge of representative institutions. I agree with you, gentlemen, that the initial rungs in the ladder of self-government, are to be found in the Municipal and District Boards and that it is in that direction that we must look for the gradual political education of the people.

In the meantime, I can only say to you that the Mohammedan community may rest assured that their political rights and interests as a community will be safeguarded in any administrative organisation with which I am concerned and that you and the people of India may rely upon the British Raj to respect, as it has been its pride to do, the religious beliefs, and the national traditions of the myriads composing the population of His Majesty's Indian Empire.

Your Highness and Gentlemen, I sincerely thank you for the unique opportunity, your deputation has given me of meeting so many distinguished and representative Mohammedans. I deeply appreciate the energy and interest in public affairs which have brought you here from great distances, and I only regret that your visit to Simla is necessarily so short.

7

Nawab Viqarul Mulk Introductory Speech at the Meeting of Muslim leaders at Dacca, December 30, 1906

The purpose for which we have met today is nothing new. It arose from the day the Indian National Congress we founded, so much so that the late lamented Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, for whose sagacious and far-sighted policy we will always remain indebted, was so moved by the growing strength of the Congress that he valiantly strove to convince the Muslims that their betterment and security lay in abstaining from participation in the Congress. This advice was so sound that, though he is not among

us today, yet the Muslims firmly hold to it, and as time passes we realise more and more that the Muslims should make the maximum efforts to protect their political rights . . . .

Realising the increase in the internal and external influence of the Congress in the wake of the partition of Bengal and noting the Government's intention to expand the legislative councils the Muslims waited in deputation on the Viceroy and placed before him their needs and the injustices they have had to suffer as a nation. The proceedings of the Deputation and the Viceroy's reply have appeared in the press. The Muslim leaders who, as members of the Deputation, had gathered at Simla, after considering the steps to be taken to safeguard the political rights of the Muslims on a permanent footing, had resolved that delegates from different provinces should meet at Dacca towards the end of December and decide the question.

The Muslims are only one-fourth of the population of other communities of India. It is quite obvious that, if at any time the British Government ceases to exist in India, the nation which is four times more numerous will rule the country. Now, gentlemen, everyone should ponder as to what would be our condition at that time. In such a contingency our lives, our property, our honour, our religion, all will be in jeopardy. Today when the might of the British Government affords protection to the people there are numerous instances of the difficulties and troubles we experience at the hands of our neighbours in the various provinces. Woe betide the time when we have to live as subjects of these people who want to take revenge of Aurangzeb from us after hundreds of years! Of course, it is our duty, as far as our influence goes, to dissuade our friends from following the wrong path, to treat them nicely as our neighbours, to show sympathy to them on the social plane and refrain from any antagonsistic attitude towards them, while safeguarding our rights and interests. Whatever differences we now have or may have in future with the Congress concern three matters—firstly, those demands of the Congress which imperil the existence of the British Government in India; secondly, those questions which are prejudicial to our legitimate rights; thirdly, their violent tone against the Government which the Muslims do not appreciate.

8

Resolutions Passed at the Meeting of Muslim Leaders at Dacca, December 30, 1906

(*i*) This meeting, composed of Mussalmans from all parts

of India, assembled at Dacca, decides that a Political Association, styled the All-India Muslim League, be formed for the furtherance of the following objects: (*a*) to promote among the Mussalmans of India, feelings of loyalty to the British Government and to remove any misconceptions that may arise as to the intentions of Government with regard to any of its measures; (*b*) to protect and advance the political rights and interests of Mussalmans of India and respectfully to represent their needs and aspirations to Government; and (*c*) to prevent the rise among Mussalmans of India of any feelings of hostility towards other communities without prejudice to the other objects of the League.

(*ii*) That this meeting considers that partition is sure to prove beneficial to the community which constitutes the majority of the population, and that all such methods of agitation as boycotting shall be firmly condemned and discouraged.

9

The Objectives of the Muslim League as redefined in the Constitution Finally Adopted at its first Regular Session at Karachi December 30, 1907

To promote among Indian Mussalmans feelings of loyalty towards the British Government and to remove any misconception that may arise as to the intention of the Government with regard to any of its measures.

To protect the political and other rights of Indian Mussalmans and to place their needs and aspirations before the Government in temporate language.

So far as possible, without prejudice to the objects mentioned under (*a*) and (*b*) of this section, to promote friendly feelings between the Mussalmans and other communities of India.

10

The Muslim League's Memorandum on Reform Proposals, March 24, 1908

The scheme for the creation of Imperial and Provincial Councils as propounded in the Government of India letter No.

2310-2317, dated August 24, 1907, has been under consideration by the All-India Muslim League in their session at Aligarh, on March 18 and 19, 1908, and they beg leave to bring to the notice of the Government their great gratification with the principles on which the scheme is based. The principle of class representation in the Legislative Councils is entirely in accord with the sentiments of the Mussalman community in this respect, and its definite recognition and enunciation by the Imperial Government will be hailed with satisfaction by Muhammadans throughout the length and breadth of the Indian Empire. . . .

The League thoroughly approves of the proposed enlargement of the Imperial Legislative Council, and in this connection endorses the two following principles laid down by the Government of India:

(*a*) That the Government should always have in the Council a standing official majority, independent of the minor fluctuations that may be caused by the occasional absence of an official member.

(*b*) That the Legislative Council should be so constituted in respect to non-official members as to give due and ample representation to the different classes and interests of the community.

The question of setting apart a fixed number of seats on the Council for the Muhammadan community is one of great importance, and the League believes that it only voices the real feeling of the Muhammadan in all parts of India. , . . . This reform will not only serve to remove one of the grievances which nave been long and sorely felt by Muhammadans in the past, but will also mean the timely recognition by the Supreme Government of the sound principle of separate racial representation on the Councils of the Indian Empire, which when fully carried out will tend to solve many of the administrative difficulties of the Government. The League, therefore, strongly supports the proposal to allot a fixed number of seats to Muhammadans on the Imperial Legislative Council, though at the same time the League cannot approve of the suggestion to limit this number to four. . . . . The Government of India having recognised the justice of the Muhammadan claim to a separate representation on the Legislative Councils of the country in the generous reply given by His Excellency the Viceroy to the address presented to him by the Muhammadan deputation at Simla on October 1, 1906. . . . the League submits that the representation so conceded should be made adequate. If this is not done, the Government of India

will, on the one hand, be accused of partiality to the Muhammadans and will incur the displeasure of those who pin their faith in the wholesale application of Western methods of Government, pure and unadulterated, as the panacea for all the ills to which this country is heir; on the other hand it will fail to satisfy the just demands of the educated Muhammadans for an adequate representation of their special interests on the enlarged Council boards.

11

Nawab Viqarul Mulk's Statement on separate electorate, 1909

On this question, there are two opinions among the Mussalmans. The opinion of the bulk of the community is opposed to participation in joint electorate. A small group including our esteemed friend, Syed Ali Imam, are of the view that the Muslims would also take advantage of joint electorate. They feel that in this way unity and harmony between the Hindus and the Muslims would be maintained and the total disassociation of the Muslims from joint electorate would completely alienate them from a large and powerful Hindu group, and it would lead to increasing tension and animosity between the two groups. I would certainly say that the Muslims should follow the policy of maintaining cordial relations with the Hindus without injuring their political rights and interests . . . . Since, I am personally of opinion that Muslims' participation in joint electorate would lead to quarrels and squabbles between the Hindus and the Muslims and impairment of their old relations, I cannot advise the Muslims to take part in joint electorate. It would be harmful for the Muslims. The best course for us is to be content with whatever Government concedes to us through separate electorate. If we feel it is not fair to us we should continue to make submissions in a respectful and moderate manner. We should feel sure that if our demands are just we would achieve our objective one day or the other. If we do not get our due in the new Reform Scheme we should not be disheartened but should continue our efforts. . . .

We should look at this question from another point of view. If we ignore the possibility of tension and clash, take a selfish attitude and participate in joint electorate, will we achieve any success? I emphatically say, there will be no success; failure would be certain and we would also face humiliation and

degradation. No one can deny that in a joint electorate the Hindus would command the majority. We may make any amount of efforts and we may knock at the doors of those to whom we do not sumbit any personal need, our workers and friends may beg and entreat them; but they will not be able to prevail upon the Hindu majority. We shall be defeated and in addition will face the disgrace of having put before them the beggar's bowl. If at all we achieve any success at any place, it will not be the result of our efforts but will be the charity of the dominant group. God knows for what promises and compensations that charity will be bestowed and what commitments of subservience will be made in return for it. Even now we see that the National Congress raises some Muslims to its presidency. Are these Muslim gentlemen then of any use to the Muslims? They cannot be even as useful as a peon to us. Thus, if anyone gets elected as a member after sacrificing his nation and national interests he may have the joy of such membership; the nation will have nothing to do with him. On the other hand, such members would sometimes be very harmful to the nation. They will sit with Muslim names in the Council but vote in a way which is detrimental to Muslim national interests; such votes will do greater harm to the Muslims that the votes of Hindu members.

Will we be able to win against the Hindus in regions where we outnumber them? In these days it seems to be very difficult. Today no army can win merely by the weight of its numbers. You need the finest weapons and armaments to achive victory. The armaments necessary for modern warfare consist of high education, wealth, political unity, strength and struggle. In all these things, we are deficient compared with the other group. There is thus no hope that mere numerical strength would be of any avail to us in those areas. I was told by a Muslim Rais of Eastern Bengal who is a member of a legislative council, that the zamindar of a village in that province is a Mussalman and the majority of the tenants too are Muslims. A Hindu and a Muslim were candidates for a seat. The zamindar's pleader, money-lender, personal treasurer and physician were all Hindus. All of them went to the zamindar and pressed him to depute his representative along with them so that he might force all the zamindar's Muslim tenants to vote for the Hindu candidate. The Muslim zamindar had to comply with the wishes of his Hindu pleader, money-lender and doctor and the Hindu candidate came out successful. This is the state of affairs in Eastern Bengal where the Muslims consitute three-fourths of the population.

In conclusion I strongly urge that the Muslims should not

enter the arena of joint electorate where we can have nothing but failure and disgrace. . . . . There are many instances in Eastern Bengal in which the Hindus got the Muslims involved in false cases and when these innocent people were thrown behind the bars they were tormented by the Bengali jailor. These excesses were perpetrated but the police did nothing to check them. Thank God, things have not deteriorated to that extent in our province. We must not commit mistakes which would have the effect of keeping up the fire of ill-feeling and antagonism between us and our Hindu countrymen and we turn into enemies.

12

Addressed presented by London Muslim League to Lord Morley, Secretary of State for India, on the question of separate electorate, January 27, 1909

We are extremely obliged to your Lordship for granting us the opportunity to place before you the views of the Muslims of India on the question of the important reforms which, under your Lordship's auspices, are to be introduced in India. We come, not only on behalf of the League in London, but also in India, for we have been authorised to represent their case before your Lordship. They deemed it advisable to send delegates over to co-operate with us in this matter, but, considering the difficulty and the delay it involved, they decided at present to leave representation of their case in our hands. We are conscious of the responsibility that has been imposed on us, and we only hope, my Lord, that we shall be able to do our duty satisfactorily to our people, and also to be of some assistance to your Lordship. Before proceeding to state our views on specific points, I shall ask permission to make one or two preliminary remarks. We welcome most cordially, most heartily, the extension of political privileges to His Majesty's Indian subjects. But to make the projected reforms a real success our co-operation with the servants of the Crown and our fellow-subjects is as much needed as it is in all matters concerning the progress and welfare of the country. My Lord, whilst we welcome these reforms, we welcome them in the conviction that, in their practical application, our status and interests will be kept in view. We do not wish, and cannot consent, to be placed in a disadvantageous position. We are anxious that whatever boons are conferred on, whatever

political concessions are made to, the people of India, we should have our legitimate share in those concessions. We ask for nothing in derogation of the just rights of any other people. We seek no special privileges; we want only our legitimate share in political rights and political privileges, and nothing more. If, in the language of the Royal Message to the princes and peoples of India, new avenues are opened out for the participation of educated Indians in the Government of the country, our people wish that their share should be kept in view. If new elements are to be introduced into any of the great Departments of State, we expect, in fairness and justice, that they should be equally balanced; and if any important departure is made in administrative policy, we want that the interests of the two great communities in India should be so co-ordinated that neither the one nor the other should be in a position to say its interests were sacrificed or subordinated to the interests of the other. That is the position we take up. The foundation of British rule in India rests upon the conviction among the people that equal justice is the chief policy of the British Government in its dealings with the varied races of that Continent. Speaking with the full consciousness of the responsibility imposed upon me, I say it would be an evil day for India if any class or any community comes to think that the interests of one community are in any way subordinated to the interests of the other. It has been said that the Mohammedans form a minority among the population of India. There, they do not equal in numbers the other great community which inhabits India, but they are seventy million souls, fifty-three of whom are under British rule. They have common ideals, and by traditions of race and religion form a nationality apart from all other people in India. To call them a minority is a misapplication of the term, and to regard them in that light would be an injustice to the Mussalman people. We form a nationality as important as any other, and our wishes, sentiments and interests should, we conceive, form as important factors in the consideration of policy and measures as those of any other. If the vast masses of low-caste people who are nominally Hindus were excluded from the Hindu figures, certainly the disparity which now appears between the Hindu and Mohammedan population would not strike as so great or so disproportionate. These tribes and communities, nominally Hindu for the purposes of census, have nothing in common with the real Hindu, to whom their touch, often their very shadow, is pollution. They can never rise out of the degraded state in which they live and have lived for centuries. Save the British official, they have no representative or protector. Some of them have made desperate

efforts to break the shakles that have bound them for ages, but they have been thrust back to their thraldom by, among other things, the judicial recognition of ancient usages. In the great reforms about to be introduced they will have no lot or place; nor are your Lordship's benevolent intentions ever likely to reach their ears. They have remained, and will remain for many decades, may be centuries, the degraded castes of India. But it would be disastrous if by placing all power and influence in the hands of privileged classes, their emancipation should be made difficult in the future. To include these communities, however, in the Hindu population, and then to compare it with the Mohammedan population, does not appear to us just.

I now come to the specific points which we wish to place before your Lordship for consideration. The first is the question of joint electorates. We feel that to confide the election of our representatives to mixed electorates would be most detrimental to the Mussalman people. Your Lordship is aware of the sharp cleavage that has taken place recently between the political conceptions of the Mohammedan people and some sections of the other communities. You are also aware of the other divergencies which exist between the Mohammedans and the non-Muslim people in India, divergencies which ramify in all directions. It might perhaps startle people in England if they were told of the trifling incidents which often inflame passions on both sides. I do not wish to dwell particularly on the character of these incidents. I only refer to them to show the gulf which still separates the rank and file of the two communities, and which the administrator must always keep in view and the statesman take into consideration, when dealing with general questions affecting both the races. Having these divergencies in view and the cleavage which has recently taken place the Mussalmans of India consider it extremely important that their representation should not be dependent on the goodwill of any other people. The important deputation that waited upon the Viceroy in 1906, emphatically urged upon His Excellency that the separate representation of the Mohammedans should begin from the lowest rung of the ladder and go up to the highest, namely, the Viceregal Council. In that way, alone will they get any benefit from the concessions which you are so generously going to inaugurate in India. It is admitted that Mohammedan representation has been most meagre under the present system on rural and district boards and municipal corporations. They serve as practical illustrations of what will happen if the system of joint electorates for the Councils is introduced. The Government of India

has admitted that Mohammedan representation has been most unsatisfactory so far, and for that reason proposes a supplemental addition of Mohammedan members elected by Mohammedans. If it be admitted that the nominees of another body, not altogether in agreement with Mohammedan opinions, cannot really or effectively represent Mohammedan wishes and feelings, in that case the matter does not require further discussion.

We say, further, that the principle of proportional representation would be fatal to our interests. The Government of India recognises, if I am not mistaken, the difficutly of meeting the requirements of the Mussalmans people, if its representation is to be based on a consideration of numbers. Whatever may be the value of the system of proportional representation in countries where the people are in the main homogeneous, we submit it is wholly unsuited to India. Save and except in the Punjab, where the Mussalmans preponderate in numbers, there is hardly any approximation between the two races. The Mohammedans say, if proportional representation happens to be introduced into India their representation would be completely swamped. In answer to this, it is said that the Government can hardly take into consideration the political and historical importance of any community in judging of the question of representation, and the Mohammedan position is compared to that of the Sikhs and the Parsees. We submit respectfully, but emphatically, that the position of the Mussalman people has no analogy to that of the minor communities of India. Neither in improtance nor in numbers are they in any way analogous to them. We share the burden of defending the empire to the same extent as our fellow countrymen, and we probably supply to the Indian Army a larger number of soldiers than most others. It is easy to say, if representation is to be conceded to Mohammedans on considerations of political and historical importance, the Sikhs should also be taken into account. That is a false analogy. In the first place, the Sikhs are accounted as Hindus, and in the second place, they number not more than two million souls. The Mohammedans stand on a totally different footing, and we submit that their position should be considered on a totally different basis. That other elements besides mere numbers enter into consideration in determining the number of representatives from each community, is clear from the case of Eastern Bengal. Here the Mohammedans are in overwhelming majority. Supposing they were to ask that Mohammedan representation should be preponderant, they would be met with the answer: Look at the

pleaders and lawyers, spread all over the country, who dominate the counsels of Government, they are Hindus and come from Eastern Bengal; look at the merchants, traders, landlords, who have taken the place of the Mohammedan zamindars and see how important they are. And the relative positions of the two communities would justly be taken into account in fixing their representation. If that argument is good for one people in Eastern Bengal, it applies with equal force in the United Provinces and Provinces similarly circumstanced to the case of the other. In the United Provinces, the Mohammedans are 14 per cent of the population, whilst the Hindus are said to be 86 per cent, although if the degraded castes were eliminated from these figures the disparity would not be so great. Considering the admitted importance of the Mohammedans in the social economy of the Province, they ought to have far greater representation than is proposed to be conceded to them. We say, therefore, that the principle of proportional representation is not applicable to India and, if introduced, would be most prejudicial to the interests of the Mohammedan community. We submit that the ratio of representation should be left to the executive authority, to be determined upon considerations of Imperial policy and local conditions and circumstances. Our representation, we beg to urge, should be not only adequate, but substantial in order to give us an effective voice in the deliberations of the various assemblies. Having in view the fact that under these reforms the privileges of the non-official members will be considerably extended, it is extremely important that our community should be represented in sufficient numbers to be able to exercise some weight, some influence on the Councils. My people will not be content with any representation which is less than adequate and substantial. On general questions racial and religious differences will probably not enter into competition, but contingencies are certain to arise in which the interests or the views of the two communities do not coincide. On these occasions, it would be necessary to take into account the balance of parties. We submit that in the constitution of the Councils it should be the aim of His Majesty's Government, and of the Government of India, to have them so balanced that not only the administrative machinery should run smoothly, but also that no party should be able to outvote the just claims of a less powerful party. We, therefore, submit as a standard of adequate representation that the number of Mohammedan members on the several Councils should be so fixed that if the Mohammedans were to join a certain number of what may be called non-partisan members, or to receive their support on any particular

question, the issue may be decided accordingly. Unless some standard of that kind is adopted, and our position sufficiently assured on the reformed Councils, our representation will be anomalous and our representatives will exercise little influence or weight. One other matter we wish to lay before your Lordship, which is embodied in paragraph 21 of our Representation: "The Committee further submit that as in the opinion of His Majesty's Government the time has arrived for the introduction of the Indian element into the Executive Councils, in the interests of the Empire, both the great communities should be represented. They consider that the introduction of a member from one community only will be regarded as seriously prejudicing the rights and interests of the other." Our people believe, my Lord, that representatives from both communities as advisers to the Government of India—whatever may be the designation given to them—would be of great assistance in the administration of that country. But they consider, it would give rise to serious difficulties if one community was represented and the other left out. We thank your Lordship for the patience with which you have listened to me. I know that the task you have undertaken is one of the most stupendous character which any Minister of the Crown in your position has undertaken, but our people feel sure that at this stage, which we consider to be the turning point in our national existence, the balance will be maintained fairly and equitably, and our interests will not be subordinated to that of any other community.

13

Syed Ameer Ali's speech on Morley-Minto Reforms at the meeting of London Muslim League, January 23, 1910

We are on the eve of great constitutional changes in the administration of India, which will undoubtedly alter its character, by giving the educated classes a larger voice in the internal government of the country. The Mohammadans consider the moment of great importance, because they feel that if they do not keep their claims well forward before the Government and the people in England and India, they may permanently and seriously prejudice their interests. They have welcomed the principles of the reforms, in the conviction that their legitimate rights will be adequately and substantially safeguarded. They have not put forward any undue claims or made any demand

which can be regarded as encroaching on the just rights of any other community. They ask for their legitimate share in the political privileges about to be extended to the peoples of India—a share "commensurate", to use the language of the Government of India, "with their numbers and their historical and political importance."

The Viceroy assured them that their political rights and interests will be safeguarded in any administrative changes in which he was concerned. The Mussalmans took their standard (sic stand) on that assurance. Their claim, based on historical and political importance, has been assailed from many not altogether uninterested quarters. With reference to these attacks, may I venture to make one answer? Barely 200 years ago, the East India Company acquired its rights to hold three of the richest provinces in India, under a grant from a Mohammadan Sovereign, and when British power extended towards the North and the West, the Mohammadan Sovereign still was the fountain-head of all legitimate right. The East India Company acknowledged his titular rights by placing his name and insignia on its coins as late as 1832. Many of the Marhatta and other Hindu Chiefs were proud to bear titles granted by Mussalman Sovereigns, and I am very much mistaken if they do not bear them even now. It is idle to say the Mohammadans of India possess no historical importance. They are connected by ties of religion, traditions and race with the whole of Western Asia and Northern Africa, right away to the Atlantic—countries where the prestige of England stands high now, and where England is recognised as the champion of justice and fair play. The Mohammadans of India expect to gain most by the present concessions. I may say again, without presumption, it is idle to say that they are of no political importance. In the social economy of the country even in those provinces where they are numerically inferior, their upper classes occupy an acknowledged position of weight and influence beyond their actual numbers.

They all feel that the happiness and development of India depend upon the co-operation of all her children, co-operation not only among themselves but also with the servants of the Crown, which has assured to the varied races and peoples of that great continent a peace and prosperity, it never enjoyed at any other period of its history. At the same time, they cannot shut their eyes to the divergencies which have divided the rank and file of the two peoples divergencies which ramify in all directions, which enter into the very minutiae of life. The two great communities of India are sometimes likened to the Roman

Catholics and Protestants in England and Ireland. I am afraid that analogy is absolutely false. Hindus and Mohammadans are not the followers of two sects or communions, but of two wholly different systems. Roman Catholics and Protestants follow one Faith and one Gospel. They differ in dogmas and ritual, but their habits of life and modes of thought, their laws, their customs and conventions are the same, there is nothing to debar them from eating at the same boards, or drinking from the same cup. They can intermarry, they can change from one community to the other. All this is different in the case of Hindus and Mohammadans. Two absolutely antithetical systems have existed side by side for ten centuries with, on the whole, great toleration to each other without amalgamation. And why? Hinduism is not merely a religion, but a complex social system of immense antiquity whose institutions have, through the observance of ages, acquired a sacredness which nothing at present foreseeable can break or alter. It is a vast conservative Federation hedged round by stringent rules of caste. No outsider can ever enter its pale. To think it has any democratic tendency or ideal is a mistake. Its admirable organisation, its very exclusiveness has enabled it to preserve through ages its ancient usages from contamination by foreign influences. Mohammadanism, on the other hand, is democratic, tending towards socialism. It opens its doors to all comers.

It is only people who are ignorant of the situation, who do not understand the situation, that talk of common citizenship. Any attempt to drive the smaller into the bigger camp will only lead to discord and strife. A Mohammadan Sovereign tried to fuse the two people by introducing a new electic system. He failed. Do you think it possible to attain that end by driving them in common to the hustings?

It is only by remembering that the two elements deserve equal consideration, that both of them are important factors in the administration of the country, by endeavouring to understand the idiosyncracies of the two nations, by not allowing the interests of the one to be subordinated to the interests or ambitions of the other, that you will make the projected Reforms successful. It is in this conviction, and not in any spirit of antagonism or racial prejudice, nor any feeling of jealousy or desire to take anything from the others, that the Mussalmans have pressed their case.

It is essential that the majority should know that the minority has sufficient questions in a spirit of compromise and

toleration (sic). So long as they feel that they can override the claims of the others, there will be no peace, no accord and no satisfactory dealing with public questions. The amount of juggling on the subject of Mohammadan representation seems to me amazing. First of all there are vast masses of people in India, who either disclaim all title to being Hindus, or who are included under the word "Hindu" for the sake of convenience. It is contended that they should be included in the Hindu figures and the question of representation should be dealt with on the basis of those figures. Well, the injustice of the proposal does not seem to strike biased minds, but it shows how impossible it is to apply to India a doctrine which is workable with any approach to equity only in countries inhabited by a homogeneous population.

14

British Ministers Observations on Separate Electorate

Lord Morley in the course of his speech, in the House of Lords February 23, 1909 said:

There is one very important chapter in these regulations which I think now on the Second Reading of the Bill, without waiting for Committee, I ought to say a few words to your Lordships about—I mean the Mohammadans. That is a part of the Bill and scheme which has no doubt attracted a great deal of criticism and excited a great deal of feeling in that very important community. We suggested to the Government of India a certain plan. We did not prescribe it, we did not order it, but we suggested and recommended this plan for their consideration —no more than that. It was the plan of mixed or composed electoral college, in which Mohammadans and Hindus should pool their votes, ,so to say. The wording of the recommendation in my Despatch was, as I soon discovered, ambiguous—a grievous defect, of which, I make hold to hope, I am not very often in public business guilty. But, to the best of my belief, under any construction the plan of Hindus and Mohammadans voting together in a mixed and composite electorate would have secured to the Mohammadan electors, wherever they were so minded, the chance of returning their own representatives in their due proportion. The political idea at the bottom of that recommendation which has found so little favour was that such composite action would bring the two great communities more closely together, and this idea of promoting harmony was held by men

of very high Indian authority and experience who were among my advisers at the India Office. But the Mohammadans protested that the Hindus would elect a pro-Hindu upon it, just as I suppose in a mixed college of say seventy-five Catholics and twenty-five Protestants voting together, the Protestants might suspect that the Catholics voting for the Protestant would choose what is called a Romanising Protestant and as little of a Protestant as they could find. . . . . At any rate, the Government of India doubted whether our plan would work, and we have abandoned it. I do not think it was a bad plan, but it is no use if you are making an earnest attempt in good faith at a general pacification, out of parental fondness for a clause interrupting that good process by sitting too tight.

The Mohammadans demand three things. I had the pleasure of receiving a deputation from them and I know very well what is in their minds. They demand the election of their own representatives to these councils in all the stages, just as in Cyprus, where, I think, the Mohammadans vote by themselves. They have nine votes and the non-Mohammadans have three, or the other way about. So in Bohemia, where Germans vote alone and have their own register. Therefore, we are not without a precedent and a parallel for the idea of a separate register. Secondly, they want a number of seats in excess of their numerical strength. Those two demands we are quite ready and intend to meet in full. There is a third demand that, if there is a Hindu on the Viceroy's Executive Council—a subject on which I will venture to say a little to your Lordships before I sit down—there should be two Indian members on the Viceroy's Council and that one should be a Mohammedan. Well, as I told them and as I now tell your Lordships, I see no chance whatever of meeting their views in that way to any extent at all.

To go back to the point of the registers, some may be shocked at the idea of a religious register at all, of a register framed on the principle of religious belief. We may wish, we do wish—certainly I do—that it were otherwise. We hope that time, with careful and impartial statesmanship, will make things otherwise. Only let us not forget that the difference between Mohammadan and Hinduism is not a mere difference of articles of religious faith. It is a difference in life, in tradition, in history, in all the social things as well as articles of belief that constitute a community. . . . .

15

Revised Creed of the Muslim League Adopted at its session at Lucknow, March 22, 1913

Attainment under the aegis of the British Crown of a system of self-government suitable to India through constitutional means, by bringing about, amongst other, a steady reform of the existing systems of administration by promoting national unity, by fostering public spirit among the people of India, and by co-operation with other communities for the said purpose.

16

Extracts from Mr M. A. Jinnah's Presidential address at the Bombay Provincial Conference held at Ahmedabad, October 1916

I believe all thinking men are thoroughly convinced that the key-note of our real progress lies in the goodwill, concord, harmony and co-operation between the two great sister communities. The true focus of progress is centred in their union and remember this is a matter which is entirely in our own hands. It was three years ago that All-India Muslim League adopted the ideal of Self-Government under the "aegis" of the British Crown which was hailed by the Indian National Congress at Karachi where the followine Resolution was passed:

"That this Congress places on record its warm appreciation of the adoption by the All-India Muslim League of the ideal of Self-Government for India within the British Empire, and expresses its complete accord with the belief that the League has so emphatically declared at its last sessions that the political future of the country depends on the harmonious working and co-operation of the various communities in the country which has been the cherised ideal of the Congress. This Congress most heartily welcomes the hope expressed by the League that the leaders of the different communities will make every endeavour to find a *modus operandi* for joint and concerted action on all questions of national good and earnestly appeals to all the sections of the people to help the object which we all have at heart."

Since then the programme of the All-India Muslim League has been more and more approximated to that of the Indian National Congress. There is but one question besides the question of cow-killing and street-music which has proved not only a thorny question but an obstacle which has kept the two communities hitherto apart. But the solution is not difficult. It requires a true spirit of conciliation and give and take. The Muhammedans want proper, adequate and effective representation in the Council chambers of the country and in the District and Municipal Boards, a claim which no right-minded Hindu disputes for a moment. But the Mohammedans further require that representation in the various Boards and Council Chambers should be secured to them by means of separate electorates. This question of separate electorates from the top to bottom has been before the country ever since 1909 and rightly or wrongly the Mussalman community is absolutely determined for the present to insist upon separate electorates. To most of us the question is no more open to further discussion or argument as it has become a mandate of the community. As far as I understand, the demand for separate electorates, is not a matter of policy but a matter of necessity to the Muhammedans who require to be roused from the coma and torpor into which they had fallen so long. I would, therefore, appeal to my Hindu brethren that in the present state of position they should try to win the confidence and trust of the Muhammedans who are, after all, in the minority in the country. If they are determined to have separate electorates, no resistance should be shown to their demand.

There are other questions of most vital and paramount importance to both the Hindus and Muhammedans, that require united and concerted action. Difference in details such as, method of securing to Muhammedans their adequate share in the Council Chambers, Municipal and District Boards should not be allowed to create an impasse and one side or the other must give in. I would, therefore, appeal to my Hindu friends to be generous and liberal and welcome and encourage other activities of Muhammedans even if it involves some sacrifice in this matter of separate electorates. And I may have to say something more fully on this question at the session of the All-India Muslim League where I have been called to preside next Christmas. But the committees, appointed by the Congress and the League in Bombay, will soon meet at Calcutta to formulate a scheme of reforms and I most fervently pray that they will both adopt a scheme that may go out to the world as united

demand of India.

One thing is, however, clear. It is not a question of a few more seats going to the Muhammedans or the Hindus. It is a question, as I have already pointed out, in the first instance, of transfer of the power from the Bureaucracy to democracy. Let us concentrate all our attention and energy on this question alone for the present.

The Hindus and the Muhammedans should stand united and use every constitutional and legitimate means to effect that transfer as soon as possible. But for a real New India to arise, all petty and small things must be given up.

She is now India irredenta and to be redeemed, all Indians must offer up sacrifice not their good things, but all those evil things they cling to blindly—their hates and their divisions, their pride in what they should be thoroughly ashamed of, their quarrels and misunderstandings. These were the sacrifices that God would love.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have done. In conclusion, let me tell you that, after all, a great deal depends upon ourselves. Hindus and Muhammedans, united and firm, the voice of the three hundred millions of people vibrating throughout the length and the breadth of the county, will produce a force which no power on earth can resist. India has, I believe, turned a corner. She has passed through great sufferings and borne them patiently for centuries. There is now a bright and a great future in front of her. We are on a straight road, the promised land is within sight. "Forward" is the motto and clear course of Young India. But in the onward march, we must be circumspect, and never lose sight of the true perspective before us. And Wisdom and Caution should be our watch-words.

17

Extracts from the Presidential Address Delivered by Mr. M.A. Jinnah at the Session of All-India Muslim League, Lucknow, December 1916

No mere conventional words are needed on my part to express my deep thanks for the great privilege you have conferred on me by selecting me as President of the Ninth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League. The honour is the

highest in the gift of the Muslim community, to which those alone may aspire, who have given freely of their thought and time to the service of the communal cause. I am fully sensible of how little I have done to deserve such distinction, nor could I have the presumption to desire it with such a clear sense of my own unworthiness. This choice, however, has come to me in the nature of a mandate from my community and in such cases individual considerations cannot and must not stand in the way of the larger Will. I accept the great and heavy responsibilities of the position only in the belief that I can unreservedly count on your sympathy, zeal and ready co-operation in the great task that lies before us.

In this great annual meeting of representative Mussalmans from all parts of India, who have come to deliberate and take counsel together on the large and important issues that govern our destiny in this land, it will not be out of place to take a wide survey of the conditions in which our lot is cast. . . . . The circumstances, however, in which we meet today, are exceptional and mark a new epoch in the history of our country. All that is great and inspiring in the common affairs of men, for which the noblest and most valiant of mankind have lived and wrought and suffered in all ages and all climes, is now moving India out of its depths. The whole country is awakening to the call of its destiny and is scanning the new horizons with eager hope. A new spirit of earnestness, confidence and resolution is abroad and in the land. In all directions are visible the stirrings of a new life. The Mussalmans of India would be false to themselves and the traditions of their past, had they not shared to the full the new hope that is moving India's patriotic sons today, or had they failed to respond to the call of their country. Their gaze, like that of their Hindu fellow-countrymen, is fixed on the future. . . .

The future historians, while chronicling the cataclysms and convulsions of these times, will not fail to note the conjunction of events of boundless influence and scope that have made the fortunes of India so largely depend on the united will and effort of this generation. These events have, of course, flowed from the world-shaking crisis into which Europe was plunged in August, 1914. What this dark period has meant in accumulated agony, suffering, destruction and loss to mankind, is beyond any standard of computation known to history. With the unfolding of this appalling tragedy have emerged into light, stark, elemental forces of savagery that lay behind a bright and glittering mask of

"Kultur", which threaten to sweep away the very foundations of civilized life and society. The issues which are in death grips on the battle-fields of three continents, go to the roots of the principles on which the fabric of modern civilization has been reared by the energy and toil of countless generations. Freedom, justice, right and public law are pitted against despotism, aggression, anarchy and brute force and the result of this deadly combat will decide the future of mankind whether the end will come with a stricken and shattered world, lying bleeding and helpless under the iron heel of the tyrant, with the whole of humanity stripped bare of its hope and faith and reduced to bondage, or whether the hideous nightmare will pass away and the world, redeemed by the blood of the heroic defenders of civilisation and freedom, regain its heritage of peace and enter a period of vaster and more glorious synthesis and reconstruction. . . . .

After such colossal upheavals as this War, the world cannot quietly slip back into its old grooves of life and thought. Much of what the existing generations have known in social and political arrangements is visibly passing away under a deluge of blood and fire. The thick crust of materialism and pampered ease, the intertia of habit, the cramping weight of convention and of institutions that have outlived their use, have fallen off from the lives of the great Western Democracies under the stress of this great struggle for existence. They have been thrown back on themselves. In the hot furnace of elemental passions, the trifles are being burnt to ashes, the gold is being made pure of dross, and when the terrible ordeal has passed, the liberated soul will feel almost primeval ease and power to plan, to build and to create fresh, ampler and freer conditions of life for the future. The range of choice would be unlimited and the need for bold constructive efforts in various directions vital and urgent. Europe after the War will call for a statesmanship of a new order to undertake the gigantic tasks of peace. The greatest victory for freedom will have to be conserved. Free nations will have to learn to live freely and intensely. Freedom itself will have to be organized, its bounds made vaster and its power of self-preservation strengthened and increased.

These tasks have peculiar urgency and significance in the case of the vast and various communities comprising the British Empire. And among the complex series of problems relating to the Imperial reconstruction awaiting British statesmanship, none is of more anxious moment than the problem of reconstruction in India. I need not set about to discuss in detail the Indian prob-

lem in all its bearings. It has been discussed threadbare by all manner of men from every conceivable angle of vision. However, there are two cardinal facts about the Indian situation which practical statesmanship will have to take into account while addressing itself to the study of the problem and its adequate solution. There is, first, the great fact of the British Rule in India with its Western character and standards of administration, which while retaining absolute power of initiative, direction and decision, has maintained for many decades unbroken peace and order in the land, administered even-handed justice, brought the Indian mind, through a widespread system of Western education, into contact with the thought and ideals of the West and thus led to the birth of a great and living movement for the intellectual and moral regeneration of the people. Here I may quote from the speech of H.E. Lord Chelmsford delivered in Calcutta the other day: "The growing self-respect and self-consciousness of her (India's) people are plants that we ourselves have watered." Secondly, there is the fact of the existence of a powerful, unifying process—the most vital and interesting result is creating out of the diverse mass of race and creed a new India fast growing to unity of thought, purpose and outlook, responsive to new appeals of territorial patriotism and nationality, stirring with new energy and aspiration and becoming daily more purposeful and eager to recover its birth-right to direct its own affairs and govern itself. To put it priefly, we have a powerful and efficient Bureaucracy of Brittsh officers responsible only to the British Parliament, governing, with methods known as benevolent despotism, a people that have grown fully conscious of their destiny and are peacefully struggling for political freedom. This is the Indian problem in a nutshell. The task of British statesmanship is to find a prompt, peaceful and enduring solution of this problem.

If it were possible to isolate the tangled group of social and political phenomena and subject it to a thorough investigation by reason unalloyed by sentiment, it would be infinitely easier to find a safe and sure path for Indian political development and advance. But and as you know pure unalloyed reason is not the chief motive power in human things. In the affairs of our common secular existence, we have to deal not with angels, but with men, with passions, prejudices, personal idiosyncrasies, innumerable cross-currents of motive, of desire, hope, fear and hate. The Indian problem has all such formidable complications in its texture. We have, for instance, the large and trained body of English officials who carry on the administration of

the country and exercise power over the well-being and happiness of the teeming millions of this land. They are most of them hard-working, efficient and conscientious public servants, and yet they are best by the prejudices and limitations that mark them as a class part. They are naturally conservative, have a rooted horror of bold administrative changes or constitutional experiments, are reluctant to part with power or associate Indians freely in the government of the country. Their main concern appears to be to work the machine smoothly, content to go through their common round from day to day, and they feel bored and worried and upset by the loud, confident and unsetting accents of New India. All this is eminently human, but it also means an enormous aggravation of the difficulties in the path of final settlement. It means in actual experience the growth of a tremendous class-interest, the interest of the governing class as distinct from, it not wholly opposed to, the interest of the governed. It is, in fact, the existence of this vast, powerful and by no means silent "interest" that explains the origin and wide currency of certain shallow, bastard and desperate political maxims, which are flung into the face of Indian patriots at the least provocation. They are familiar enough to all students of Indian affairs. As an sample, we may take the following:

(1) Democratic institutions cannot thrive in the environment of the East. (Why? Were democratic institutions unknown to the Hindus and Mohammedans in the past? What was the village Panchayet? What are the history, the traditions, the literature and the precepts of Islam? There are no people in the world who are more democratic even in their religion than the Mussalmans).

(2) The only form of Government suitable to India is autocracy, tempered by English (European) efficiency and character. (All nations have had to go through the experience of despotic or autocratic government at one time or the other in the history of the world. Russia was liberated to a certain extent only a few years ago. France and England had to struggle before they conquered the autocracy. Is India to remain under the heel of a novel form of autocracy in the shape of bureaucracy for all time to come, when Japan and even China have set up constitutional Governments on the democratic lines of Great Britain and America?)

(3) (*a*) The interests of the educated classes are opposed to those of the Indian masses; and

(*b*) The former would oppress the latter if the strong protecting hands of the British officials were withdrawn.

(This astonishing proposition beats all reason and sense. It is suggested that we who are the very kith and kin of the masses. most of us springing from the middle classes, are likely to oppress the people if more power is conferred, that the masses require protection at the hands of the English Officials between whom and the people there is nothing in common, that our interests are opposed to those of the masses in what respect, it is never pointed out and that, therefore, the monopoly of the administrative control should continue in the hands of non-Indian Officials. This insidious suggestion, which is so flippantly made, is intended to secure the longest possible lease for the bureaucracy and to enjoy their monopoly. But it can neither stand the light of facts, nor the analysis of truth. One has only to look at the past records of the Congress for more than a quarter of a century and of the All-India Muslim League to dismiss this specious plea. The educated people of this country have shown greater anxiety and solicitude for the welfare and advancement of the masses than for any other question during the last quarter of a century.)

(4) Indians are unfit to govern themselves. (With this last question, I propose to deal later in my speech.)

These are a few of the baseless and silly generalities in which the advocates of the existing methods of Indian governance indulge freely and provocatively when the least menace arises to the monopoly of the bureaucratic authority and power.

Internal Situation

Again, if we turn to the internal situation in India, we meet with a set of social, ethnological and cultural conditions unparalleled in recorded history. We have a vast continent inhabited by 315 millions of people sprung from various racial stocks, inheriting various cultures and professing a variety of religious creeds. This stupendous human group, thrown together under one physical and political environment, is still in various stages of intellectual and moral growth. All this means a great diversity of outlook, purpose and endeavour. Every Indian Nationalist who has given close and anxious thought to the problem of nation-building in India, fully realises the magnitude of his task. He is not afraid of admitting frankly that difficulties have no terrors for him. They are already vanishing before the forces which are

developing in the New Spirit.

Well, these are the broad aspects of the Indian problem and they will give you a fairly general idea of the obstacles that stand in the way of a full and speedy realisation of the ideals of Indian patriots. We have a powerfully organised body of conservative "interest" on the one hand, and a lack of complete organization of the national will and intelligence on the other. There is, however, one fundamental fact that stands out clear and unmistakable, which no sophistry of argument and no pseudo-scientific theories about colour and race can disguise. Amid the clash of warring interests and the noise of foolish catchwords, no cool-headed student of Indian affairs can lose sight of the great obvious truism that India is in the first and the last resort for the Indians. Be the time near or distant, the Indian people are bound to attain to their full stature as a selfgoverning nation. No force in the world can rob them of their destiny and thwart the purposes or Providence. British statesmanship has not become bankrupt or utterly bereft of its faculty of clear political perception, and it is, therefore, bound to recognise that the working of the law of national development in India, which came to birth with the British Rule itself and is daily gathering momentum under the pressure of the world-forces of freedom and progress, must sooner or later produce a change in the principles and methods of Indian governance. It is inevitable. Then why fight against it, why ignore it, why should not rather there be honest, straightforward efforts to clear the way of doubts, suspicions and senseless antagonisms to that glorious consummation? Leaving aside hair-brained twaddle of the tribe of scientific peddlers who love to sit in pretensions on the East and ape political philosophy, no man with the least pretensions to common-sense, can affect to maintain that the Indian humanity is stamped with a ruthless psychology and cramped for ever within the prison of its skull. If the Indians are not the Pariahs of Nature, if they are not out of the pale or operation of the laws that govern mankind elsewhere, if their minds can grow in knowledge and power and can think and plan and organise together for common needs of the present and for common hopes of the future, then the only future for them is self-government i.e. the attainment of the power to apply through properly organised channels the common national will and intelligence to the needs and tasks of their national existence. The cant of unfitness must die. The laws of Nature and the doctrines of common humanity are not different in the East.

It is a great relief to think that some of the responsible

British statesmen have definitely pronounced in recent years that India's ambition to attain self-Government is neither a catastrophe nor a sin. Indeed, that great and sympathetic Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, whose memory will always be cherished with affection by the people of this country, for the first time recognised the legitimacy of that vital Indian aspiration. Other indications have not been wanting of late, which go to show that our national dream and purpose is gaining the stamp of even official approval. There is, however, a world of difference between a theoretical approval of an ideal and its practical application. The supreme duty of the men that led the forces of Indian progress is to insist that India's rulers should definitely set the ideal before them as the ultimate goal to be attained within reasonable time and should accelerate the pace accordingly. All our difficulties now arise from the steady reluctance on the part of Indian officialdom to keep this end definitely in view and move faster. Mere sympathy divorced from resolute and active progressive policy can hardly ameliorate the situation. Honeyed words alone cannot suffice. We may congratulate each other about a changed "angle of vision" and yet remain where we are till doomsday. The time for definite decision and a bold move forward has arrived. The vital question today is: Is India fit to be free and to what extent? There can be no shelving of the issue at this juncture. It must be settled one way or the other. If she is not fit today, she has got to be made fit for self-Government. This, I maintain, is no less a duty and responsibility of the Government than the people themselves.

Is India fit for freedom? We, who are present here today, know fully well that from the Indian standpoint there can be but one answer. Our critics would probably challenge our conviction. Our only reply to them would be to go forward and put the matter to the proof. After all, what is the test of fitness? If we turn to history, we find that in the past only such people have been declared to have been fit for freedom who fought for it and attained it. We are living in different times. Peace has its victories. We are fighting and can only fight constitutional battles. This peaceful struggle is not and will not be wanting in the quality of vigour and sacrifice, and we are determined to convince the British Empire that we are fit for the place of a partner within the Empire, and nothing less will satisfy India.

But apart from the numerous other considerations that have repeatedly been urged in support of the claims of India to responsible and representative form of Government, the one that has grown to be of infinitely larger weight and urgency is

the living and vigorous spirit of patriotism and national self-consciousness which is chafing under irksome restraints and is seeking wider and legitimate outlets for service and self-expression. The strength and volume of this spirit, this pent-up altruistic feeling and energy of youth, can be easily realised by those who have their finger on the pulse of the country. The most significant and hopeful aspect of this spirit is that it has taken its rise from a new-born movement in the direction of national unity which has brought Hindus and Mussalmans together involving and brotherly service for the common cause. Bombay had the good fortune to see the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League meet for the first time in the same city last December. These simultaneous Sessions were brought about with no little labour, anxiety and trouble. I do not wish to go into past controversy, but I venture to say that the Session of the All-India Muslim League at Bombay will go down to posterity as peculiarly interesting in its results. The so-called opponents of ours, although for the time being they caused the utmost anxiety and individual risks—which, after all, do not count in a national movement, have, I cannot help saying, rendered the greatest service to our cause. Their unjust attitude served only to stiffen the back of the community. The League rose Phoenix-like, stronger, more solidified and determined in its ideals and aspirations, with added strength of resolution in carrying out its programme. And today your historic city of Lucknow, the centre of Mussalman culture and intellect, where three years ago the All-India Muslim League laid down our cherished ideal of self-government under the "aegis" of the British Crown, is witnessing the simultaneous Sessions of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League once more. Indeed, the person who fails to read in the Hindu-Muslim *rapprochement* within the last few years the first great sign of the birth of united India has little knowledge of the political conditions of a few years ago and has no business to talk of India's future.

I need hardly say that the Hindu-Muslim question had hitherto lain as a colossal riddle athwart the numerous unifying forces that make for the evolution of a common Indian Nationality. The new temper that we witness today is the measure of the change that has happily come over Hindu-Muslim relations. What this change really signifies can only be judged by a reference to the state of things that obtained only a few years ago, when mutual distrust and suspicion were rampant and communal bigots on either side ruled the roost. Everyone of us can easily

recall the frame of Muslim mind and feeling in which the All-India Muslim League was founded at Dacca. To put it frankly, the All-India Muslim League came into existence as an organisation with the main object of safe-guarding Muslim interests. Mussalmans, as a community, had till then abstained from all manner of political agitation and they were naturally moved by the loud and insistent demand for constitutional and administrative reforms which Hindu politicians were pressing on the Indian Government. They felt, and rightly, the need of organising themselves for political action, lest the impending changes initiated by a liberal Secretary of State should swamp them altogether as a community. This was perhaps the only course open to a community proud of the traditions of its past, yet weak in numbers and lacking the strength that organised political activity alone can give. The main principle on which the first All-India Muslim political organization was based, was the retention of Muslim communal individuality strong and unimpaired in any constitutional readjustment that might be made in the course of its political evolution. The creed has grown and broadened with the growth of political life and thought in the community. In its general outlook and ideal as regards the future, the All-India Muslim League stands abreast of the Indian National Congress and is ready to participate in any patriotic efforts for the advancement of the country as a whole. In fact, this readiness of the educated Muslims, only about a decade after they first entered the field of politics, to work shoulder to shoulder with the other Indian communities for the common good of all, is to my mind the strongest proof of the value and need of the separate Muslim political organisation at present. I have been a staunch Congressman throughout my public life and have been no lover of sectarian cries, but it appears to me that the reproach of "separatism" sometimes levelled at Mussalmans, is singularly inapt and wide of the mark, when I see this great communal organisation rapidly growing into a powerful factor for the birth of United India. A minority must, above everything else, have a complete sense of security before its broader political sense can be evoked for co-operation and united endeavour in the national tasks. The Mussalmans of India that security can only come through adequate and effective safeguards as regards their political existence as a community. Whatever my individual opinion may be, I am here to interpret and express the sense of the overwhelming body of Muslim opinion, of which the All-India Muslim League is the political organ.

It is a matter of infinite gratification to me as well as to all

patriotic Mussalmans that the Muslim communal position in this matter has been recognised and met in an ungrudging spirit by the leaders of the great Hindu community. This was so amply demonstrated by the happy and unanimous decision that was arrived at by the Committees of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League that met at Calcutta only last November. Our joint Conferences in Lucknow were marked by honest efforts on either side to find a lasting solution of our differences, and I rejoice to think that a final settlement has at last been reached which sets the seal on Hindu-Muslim co-operation and opens a new era in the history of our country. A few irreconcilable spirits in either camp may still exist here and there, but the atmosphere has on the whole been rid of the menace of sectarian thunder and the prospects of the future are bright with a promise that gladdens the hearts of India's devoted sons. Just as I have no sympathy with a member of my community who even with an assured communal existence would not extend the hand of fellowship to his Hindu brother, so I cannot appreciate the attitude of the Hindu patriot who would insist on his pound of flesh though, in this struggle, the entire future of the country for the sake of a small gain to one side or the other may be marred for ever. As an instance, I would like to point out the recent unfortunate controversy that was raised in these Provinces over the passing of the Municipal Act. But surely, we are not wanting in political wisdom and sagacity. Let us remember, whether Hindus or Mussalmans, that New India wants a wholly different type of public worker, of more generous spirit and ampler mould, free from the egoism of sect and the narrowness of bigotry, one who can resist the temptation to crush the weak and yet would not quail before the aggression of the strong, who can rise above the petty preoccupations of the day to the higher plane of devotion and service which alone can give to a people faith, hope freedom and power.

With the satisfactory solution of the most formidable problem that stood in the path of Indian progress towards political co-operation and unity, our constitutional battle may be said to have been half won already. The united Indian demand based on the actual needs of the country and framed with due regard to time and circumstances, must eventually prove irresistibe. It must also be recognised that those responsible for the Government of India have already shown a disposition to truth the existing grievances of the people in a broader spirit of understanding and sympathy. With the restoration of peace, the Indian problem will have to be dealt with on bold and generous lines

and India will have to be granted her birth-right as a free, responsible and equal member of the British Empire. How this change is to be effected and what are to be the lines of development and methods of solution are matters that have been fully occupying the thought of Indian publicists for the past two years and authoritiative scheme of readjustment have already been formulated and placed before the Government by the nineteen elected representative of the Imperial Council. You are aware that a committee of the All-India Muslim League was formed last year and was authorised to draw up a scheme of reform in consultation with the Committee of the Indian National Congress. That scheme is ready and will, at this Session, be submitted to you for your consideration and judgment.

After you have adopted the scheme of reforms you should see that the Congress and the League take concerted measures to have a Bill drafted dy constitutional lawyers as an amending Bill to the Government of India Act which embodies the present constitution of our country. The Bill when ready should be adopted by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League and a deputation of leading and representative men from both the bodies should be appointed to see that the Bill is introduced into the British Parliament and adopted. For that purpose, we should raise as large a fund as possible to supply the sinews of war until our aim and object are fulfilled.

The first and the foremost question that requires to be put at rest, is that the position of India in the Empire should be defined in the most unequivocal terms. It should be made clear by the Government in an authoritative manner that Self-Government is not a mere distant goal that may be attained at some future indefinite time, but that self-Government for India is the definite aim and object of the Government to be given to the people within a reasonable time. That should be the aim and object of the reconstruction and reformation of the present constitution of the Government of India and immediate steps should be taken after the War to introduce the reforms towards that end in view, both the Government and the people. . . . .

Next, it is well-known that the reforms that are sought by the people of India to be introduced in the constitutional Government of India, were fully adumbrated recently by the 19 elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council and I do not wish to repeat them here, as I believe you are all familiar with them already. I was one of the signatories and I would

urge upon you to follow them substantially as far as fundamental principles are involved in those proposals. Those demands were formulated by responsible men who owe duty to the Government and the people alike as "chosen representatives" not in a spirit of bargaining. Those demands are the minimum in the strictest sense of the word. It is said that these are extravagant demands. It is said that it is a big thing. It is said that we are not yet ready for them. It is said that if these reforms are introduced, there will be chaos, and particulary the Anglo-Indian Press is not only most unreasonable and disappointing, but alarmed. These are mere destructive methods. Similar fears were raised and arguments advanced when the Minto-Morley Reforms were on the Legislative anvil. But what is the verdict now, official and non-official, after nearly seven years of actual trial? Need I give the answer? We have not been favoured either by our critics or by the Government as to what is the alternative scheme. We are not taken into the confidence of the secret chambers of the Government where the Government of India, it is said, have been deliberating upon and preparing a despatch containing their proposals of reform to be submitted to the Secretary of State for India. In England, the representatives of the Colonies and the Press and the people and the Ministers are freely discussing the reconstruction of the constitution of the Empire after the War, nay even before the War is over, it is suggested to set up an Imperial Council, whereas in India, we are denied the opportunity of knowing even what the Government are contemplating. It will be a great misfortune if any decisions are arrived at with regard to the future of India by the Government and the Secretary of State for India without the proposals being published and placed before the country at large for public criticism and opinion. I must earnestly urge upon the Government that before any final decision is arrived at, the proposed reforms should be published and the people should be given an opportunity to urge their views, and that they should be taken into their confidence. I feel that if the people are bitterly disappointed at this juncture, it will mean the greatest disaster to the future progress of this country.

I should be failing in my duty towards my own people and the Government if I did not, at this crisis, make it clear that of the many delicate questions, there is none that requires a closer attention and study than the question of the Caliphate by the Government and the Ministers of Great Britain. The sentiments and feelings and the religious convictions not only of the Mussalmans of India but of the Mussalmans of the world are

not to be lightly treated. The loyalty of the Mussalmans of India to the Government is no small asset. From the very commencement of the great crisis through which the British Empire has been passing, the allegiance of the Mussalmans to the Crown and their loyalty to the Government has remained whole-hearted and unshaken. May I, therefore, urge that the Government should have regard for their dearest and most sacred religious feelings and under no circumstances interfere with the question of the future of the Caliphate. It should be left entirely to the Mussalmans to acknowledge and accept their own Caliph. I do not desire to dilate on this grave and delicate subject, but much deeper currents underlie this exceptional exhortation of mine, which I have ventured to make both in the interests of the Mussalmans and the Government of Great Britain, than it would be expedient at present to discuss on a public platform. But the Mussalmans may well claim that their feelings and sentiments relating to their most cherished traditions should receive consideration in the general policy of the Empire, particularly when they coincide with the demands of justice, humanity and international obligations.

As a spokesman of the Mussalmans of India, I must here acknowledge that the noble assurance of the British Government given to them through H.E. Lord Hardinge, the late Viceroy of India, as regards the Holy Places of Islam, was received by them not only with the utmost satisfaction, but with profound gratitude.

I may say a word as to the attitude of the Mussalmans of India towards the Government. Our clear duty is to be loyal and respectful, without stooping to a cringing policy. We want no favours, and crave for no partial treatment. That is demoralising to the community and injurious to the State. The Mussalmans must learn to have self-respect. What we want is a healthy and fair impetus to be given to our aspirations and ideals as a community and it is the most sacred duty of Government to respond to that claim. Towards the Hindus our attitude should be of goodwill and brotherly feelings. Co-operation in the cause of our Motherland should be our guiding principle. India's real progress can only be achieved by a true understanding and harmonious relations between the two great sister communities. With regard to our own affairs, we can depend upon nobody but ourselves. We should infuse greater spirit of solidarity into our society. We should remove the root causes and the evil effects of the process of disintegration. We should maintain a sustained loyalty to and co-operation with each other. We should sink per-

sonal differences and subordinate personal ambitions to the well-being of the community. We must recognise that no useful purpose is served in petty disputes and in forming party combinations. We should not lose the sympathy of our well-wishers in India and in England by creating a wrong impression that we, as a community, are out only for self-interest and self-gain. We must show by our words and deeds that we sincerely and earnestly desire a healthy National unity. For the rest, the 70 millions of Mussalmans need not fear.

18

The Joint Scheme of Reforms, Popularly Known as 'Lucknow Pact' Adopted by the Congress and the Muslim League at their Session at Lucknow, December 1916

REFORM SCHEME

I—Provincial Legislative Councils

1. Provincial Legislative Councils shall consist of four-fifths elected and of one-fifth nominated members.

2. Their strength shall be not less than 125 members in the major provinces, and from 50 to 75 in the minor provinces.

3. The members of Councils should be elected directly by the people on as broad a franchise as possible.

4. Adequate provision should be made for the representation of important minorities by election, and the Muslims should be represented through special electorates on the Provincial Legislative Councils in the following proportions:

Punjab—One-half of the elected Indian Members.
United Provinces—30 p.c. ,, ,,
Bengal—40 p.c. ,, ,,
Bihar—25 p.c. ,, ,,
Central Provinces—15 p.c. ,, ,,
Madras—15 p.c. ,, ,,
Bombay—one-third ,, ,,

Provided that no Muslim shall participate in any of the other elections to the Imperial or Provincial Legislative Councils, save and except those by electorates representing special interests.

Provided further that no Bill, nor any clause thereof, nor a resolution introduced by a non-official member affecting one or the other community, which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the Legislative Council concerned, shall be proceeded with, if three-fourth of the members of that community in the particular Council, Imperial or Provincial, oppose the Bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.

5. The head of the Provincial Government should not be the President of the Legislative Council, but the Council should have the right of electing its President.

6. The right of asking supplementary questions should not be restricted to the member putting the original question, but should be allowed to be exercised by any other member.

7. (*a*) Except customs, post, telegraph, mint, salt, opium, railways, army and navy, and tributes from Indian States, all other sources of revenue should be Provincial.

(*b*) There should be no divided heads of revenue. The Government of India should be provided with fixed contributions from the Provincial Governments, such fixed contribution being liable to revision when extraordinary and unforeseen contingencies render such revision necessary.

(*c*) The Provincial Council should have full authority to deal with all matters affecting the internal administration of the Province, including the power to raise loans, to impose and alter taxation and vote on the Budget. All items of expenditure, and all proposals concerning ways and means for raising the necessary Revenue should be embodied in Bills and submitted to the Provincial Council for adoption.

(*d*) Resolutions on all matters within the purview of the Provincial Government should be allowed for discussion in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself.

(*e*) A resolution passed by the Provincial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Executive Government, unless vetoed by the Governor-in-Council, provided, however, that if the resolution is again passed by the Council after an interval of not less than one year, it must be given effect to.

(*f*) A motion for adjournment may be brought forward for the discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance, if supported by not less than one-eighth of the members present.

8. A special meeting of the Provincial Council may be summoned on a requisition by not less than one-eighth of the members.

9. A Bill, other than a Money Bill may be introduced in

Council in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself, and the consent of the Government should not be required therefore.

10. All Bills passed by Provincial Legislatures shall have to receive the assent of the Governor before they become, Law, but may be vetoed by the Governor-General.

11. The term of office of the members shall be five years.

II—Provincial Governments

1. The head of every Provincial Government shall be a Governor who shall not ordinarily belong to the Indian Civil Service or any of the permanent services.

2. There shall be in every Province an Executive Council which, with the Governor, shall constitute the Executive Government of the Province.

3. Members of the Indian Civil Service shall not ordinarily be appointed to the Executive Councils.

4. Not less than one-half of the members of the Executive Council shall consist of Indians to be elected by the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Council.

5. The terms of office of the members shall be five years.

III—Imperial Legislative Council

1. The strength of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be 150.

2. Four-fifth of the members shall be elected.

3. The franchise of the Imperial Legislative Council should be widened as far as possible on the lines of the electorates for Muslims for the Provincal Legislative Councils, and the elected members of the Provinicial Legislative Councils should also form an electorate for the return of members of the Imperial Legislative Council.

4. One-third of the Indian elected members should be Muslims elected by separate Muslim electorates in the several Provinces, in the proportion, as nearly as may be, in which they are represented on the Provincial Legislative Council by separate Muslims electorates.

Vide Provisos to Section 1, Clause 4

5. The President of the Council shall be elected by the Council itself.

6.The right of asking supplementary questions shall not be

restricted to the member putting the original question but should be allowed to be exercised by any other member.

7. A special meeting of the Council may be summoned on requisition by not less than one-eighth of the members.

8. A Bill, other than a Money Bill, may be introduced in Council in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself, and the consent of the Executive Government should not be required therefor.

9. All Bills passed by the Council shall have to receive the assent of the Governor-General before they become Law.

10. All financial proposals relating to sources of income and items of expenditure shall be embodied in Bill. Every such Bill and the Budget as a whole shall be submitted for the vote of the Imperial Legislative Council.

11. The term of office of members shall be five years.

12. The matters mentioned herein below shall be exclusively under the control of the Imperial Legislative Council:

(*a*) Matters in regard to which uniform legislation for the whole of India is desirable.

(*b*) Provincial legislation in so far as it may affect inter-Provincial fiscal relations.

(*c*) Questions affecting purely Imperial Revenue, excepting tributes from Indian States.

(*d*) Questions affecting purely Imperial expenditure, except that no resolution of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Governor-General-in-Council in respect of military charges for the defence of the country.

(*e*) The right of revising Indian tariffs and customs duties, of imposing, altering, or removing any tax or cess, modifying the existing system of currency and banking, and granting any aids or bounties to any or all deserving and nascent industries of the country.

(*f*) Resolutions on all matters relating to the administration of the country as a whole.

13. A resolution passed by the Legislative Council should be binding on the Executive Government unless vetoed by the Governor-General-in-Council; provided, however, that if the resolution is again passed by the Council after an interval of not less than one year, it must be given effect to.

14. A motion for adjournment may be brought forward for the discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance if supported by not less than one-eighth of the members present.

15. When the Crown chooses to exercise its power of veto in regard to a Bill passed by the Provincial Legislative Council or by the Imperial Council, it should be exercised within twelve months from the date on which it is passed, and the Bill shall cease to have effect as from the date on which the fact of such veto is made known to the Legislative Council concerned.

16. The Imperial Legislative Council shall have no power to interfere with the Government of India's direction of the military affairs and the foreign and political relations of India, including the declaration of war, the making of peace and the entering into treaties.

IV—The Government of India

1. The Governor-General of India will be the head of the Government of India.

2. He will have an Executive Council, half of whom shall be Indians.

3. The Indian members should be elected by the elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council.

4. Members of the Indian Civil Service shall not ordinarily be appointed to the Executive Council of the Governor-General.

5. The power of making all appointments in the Imperial Civil Services shall vest in the Government of India, as constituted under this scheme, due regard being paid to existing interests, subject to any laws made by the Imperial Legislative Council.

6. The Government of India shall not ordinarily interfere in the local affairs of a Province, and powers not specifically given to a Provincial Government shall be deemed to be vested in the former. The authority of the Government of India will ordinarily be limited to general supervision and superintendence over the Provincial Governments.

7. In Legislative and Administrative matters, the Government of India, as constituted under this scheme, shall, as far as possible, be independent of the Secretary of State.

8. A system of independent audit of the accounts of the Government of India be instituted.

V—The Secretary of State in Councii

1. The Council of the Secretary of State for India should be abolished.

2. The salary of the Secretary of State should be placed on the British Estimates.

3. The Secretary of State should, as far as possible, occupy the same position in relation to the Government of India, as the Secretary of State for the Colonies does in relation to the Government of the Self-Governing Dominions.

4. The Secretary of State for India should be assisted by two Permanent Under-Secretaries, one of whom should always be an Indian.

VI—India and the Empire

1. In any Council or other body which may be constituted or convened for the settlement or control of Imperial affairs, India shall be adequately represented in like manner with the Dominions and with equal rights.

2. Indians should be placed on a footing of equality in respect of status and rights of citizenship with other subjects of His Majesty the King through the Empire.

VII—Military and other Matters

1. The Military and Naval services of His Majesty, both in their commissioned and non-commissioned ranks, should be thrown open to Indians and adequate provision should be made for their selection, training and instruction in India.

2. Indians should be allowed to enlist as volunteers.

3. Executive Officers in India shall have no judicial powers entrusted to them, and the judiciary in every province shall be placed under the highest Court of that Province.

19

Announcement of British policy made by Mr E.S. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, August 20, 1917

The policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institu-

tions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of the highest importance as a preliminary to considering what these steps should be that there should be a free and informal exchange of opinion between those in authority at home and in India. His Majesty's Government have accordingly decided, with His Majesty's approval, that I should accept the Viceroy's invitation to proceed to India to discuss these matters with the Viceroy and the Government of India, to consider with the Viceroy the views of local Governments, and to receive with him the suggestions of representative bodies and others.

I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance, and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility.

Ample opportunity will be afforded for public discussion of the proposals which will be submitted in due course to Parliament.

20

The Montagu-Chelmsford Report on Communal Electorates, 1918

The crucial test to which, as we conceive, all proposals should be brought is whether they will or will not help to carry India towards responsible government. Some persons hold that for a people such as they deem those of India to be, so divided by race, religion and caste as to be unable to consider the interests of any but their own section, a system of communal and class representation is not merely inevitable but is actually best . . . . But when we consider what responsible government implies, and how it was developed in the world we cannot take this view. We find it in its earliest beginnings on an effective sense of the common interests, a bond compounded of community of race, religion and language. In the earlier form which it assumed in Europe it appeared only when the territorial principle had

vanquished the tribal principle, and blood and religion had ceased to assert a rival claim with the State to a citizen's allegiance; and throughout its development in western countries, even in cases where special reasons to the contrary were present, it has rested consistently on the same root principle. The solitary examples that we can discover of the opposing principle are those of Austria, a few of the smaller German states, and Cyprus. It is hardly necessary to explain why we dismiss these as irrelevant or unconvincing. We conclude unhesitatingly that the history of self-Government among the nations who developed it, and spread it through the world is decisively against the admission by the State of any divided allegiance; against the State's arranging its members in any way which encourages them to think of themselves primarily as citizens of any smaller unit than itself.

Indian lovers of their country would be the first to admit that India generally has not yet acquired the citizen spirit, and if we are really to lead her to self-government, we must do all that we possibly can to call it forth in her people. Division by creeds and classes means the creation of political camps organised against each other, and teaches men to think as partisans and not as citizens; and it is difficult to see how the change from this system to national representation is ever to occur. The British Government is often accused of dividing men in order to govern them. But if it unnecessarily divides them at the very moment when it professes to start them on the road to governing themselves, it will find it difficult to meet the charge of being hypocritical or short-sighted.

There is another important point. A minority which is given special representation owing to its weak and backward state, is positively encouraged to settle down into a feeling of satisfied security; it is under no inducement to educate and qualify itself to make good the ground which it has lost compared with the stronger majority. On the other hand, the latter will be tempted to feel that they have done all they need do for their weaker fellow countrymen and that they are free to use their power for their own purposes. The give-and-take which is the essence of political life is lacking. There is no inducement to the one side to forbear, or to the other to exert itself. The communal system stereotypes existing relations.

We regard any system of communal electorates, therefore, as a very serious hindrance to the development of the self-governing principle. The evils of any extension of the system are

plain. Already communal representation has been actually proposed for the benefit of a majority in Madras. At the same time we must face the hard facts. The Muhammadans were given special representation with separate electorates in 1909. The Hindus' acquiescence is embodied in the present agreement between the political leaders of the two communities. The Muhammadans regard these as settled facts, and any attempt to go back on them would rouse a storm of bitter protest and put a severe strain on the loyalty of a community which has behaved with conspicuous loyalty during a period of very great difficulty. and which we know to be feeling no small anxiety for its own welfare under a system of popular governments.The Muhammadans regard separate representation and communal electorates as their only adequate safeguards . . . . Much as we regret the necessity, we are convinced that so far as the Muhammadans at all events are concerned the present system must be maintained until conditions alter, even at the price of slower progress towards the realization of a common citizenship. But we can see no reason to set up communal representation for Muhammadans in any province where they form a majority of the voters.

21

Principles of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report

Let us now consider the principles on which our proposals are based . . . . It follows from our premises, and it is also recognised in the announcement of August 20, that the steps are to be gradual and the advance tested at each stage. Consistently with these requirements a substantial step is to be taken at once. If our reasoning is sound, this can be done only by giving from the outset some measure of responsibility to representatives chosen by an electorate. There are obviously three levels at which it is possible to give it—in the sphere of local bodies, in the provinces, and in the Government of India . . . . As we go upwards, the importance of the retarding factors increases; and it follows that popular growth must be more rapid and extensive in the lower levels than in the higher. Let us state the proposition in another way. The functions of government can be arranged in an ascending scale of urgency, ranging from those which concern the comfort and well-being of the individual to those which secure the existence of the State. The individual understands best the matters which concern him and of which he has experience; and he is likely to handle best the things which he best understands. Our predecessors perceived this before us, and

placed such matters to some extent under popular control. Our aim should be to bring them entirely under such control. This brings us to our first formula:

There should be, as far as possible, complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independsnce for them of outside control.

When we come to the Provincial Governments the position is different. Our objective is the realisation of responsible government. We understand this to mean first, that the members of the executive government should be responsible to, because capable of being changed by, their constituents; and, secondly that these constituents should exercise their power through the agency of their representatives in the assembly. These two conditions imply in their completeness that there exist constituencies based on a franchise broad enough to represent the interests of the general population, and capable of exercising an intelligent choice in the selection of their representatives; and, secondly, that it is recognised as the constitutional practice that the executive Government retains office only so long as it commands the support of a majority in the assembly. But in India these conditions are as yet wanting.... We must proceed, therefore, by transferring reponsibility for certain functions of government while reserving control over others. From this starting point we look for a steady approach to the transfer to complete responsibility. We may put our second formula thus:

"The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the progressive realisation of responsible government should be taken. Some measure of responsibility should be given at once, and our aim is to give complete responsibility as soon as conditions permit. This involves at once giving the provinces the largest measure of independence, legislative, administrative, and financial, of the Government of India which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities."

But, as we shall see, any attempt to establish equilibrium between the official and popular forces in government inevitably introduces additional complexity into the administration. For such hybrid arrangements precedents are wanting; their working must be experimental, and will depend on factors that are yet largely unknown. We are not prepared, without experience of their results, to effect like changes in the Government of India. Nevertheless, it is desirable to make the Indian Legislative Council more truly representative of Indian opinion, and to give that opinion greater opportunities of acting on the Government.

While, therefore, we cannot commend to Parliament a similar and simultaneous advance both in the provinces and in the Government of India, we are led to the following proposition:

"The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament, and saving such responsibility, its authority in essential matters must remain indisputable, pending experience of the effect of the changes now to be introduced in the provinces. In the meantime the Indian Legislative Council should be enlarged and made more representative and its opportunities of influencing Government increased."

Further, the partial control of the executive in the provinces by the legislature, and the increasing influence of the legislature upon the executive in the Government of India will make it necessary that the superior control over all Governments in India which is now exercised by the authorities at home must be in corresponding measure abated: for otherwise the executive Governments in India will be subjected to pressure from different sources will wholly paralyse their liberty of action and also the different pressures may be exercised in opposite direction. We may put this proposition briefly as follows:

"In proportion as the foregoing changes take effect, the control of Parliament and the Secretary of State over the Government of India and provincial Governments must be relaxed."

22

Mr M.A. Jinnah's letter to the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, Resigning from Membership of the Imperial Legislative Council in Protest Against the Passage of Rowlatt Bill which Suppressed Civil Liberties

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
Bombay.
March 28, 1919.

Your Excellency,

The passing of the Rowlatt Bill by the Government of India, and the assent given to it by your Excellency as Governor-General against the will of the people, has severely shaken the trust reposed by them in British justice. Further, it has clearly

demonstrated the constitution of the Imperial Legislative Council which is a legislature but in name—a machine propelled by a foreign Executive. Neither the unanimous opinion of the non-official Indian members nor the entire public opinion and feeling outside has met with the least respect.

The Government of India and Your Excellency, however, have thought it fit to place on the Statute-book a measure admittedly obnoxious and decidedly coercive at a time of peace, thereby substituting the executive for the judicial.

Besides, by passing this Bill, Your Excellency's Government have actively negatived every argument they advanced but a year ago when they appealed to India for help at the War Conference and have ruthlessly trampled upon the principles for which Great Britain avowedly fought the war.

The fundamental principles of justice have been uprooted and the constitutional rights of the people have been violated at a time when there is no real danger to the State by an over-fretful and incompetent bureaucracy which is neither responsible to the people nor in touch with real public opinion and their sole plea is that the powers when they are assumed will not be abused.

I, therefore, as a protest against the passing of the Bill and the manner in which it was passed tender my resignation as a member of the Imperial Legislative Council for I feel that under the prevailing conditions I can be of no use to my people in the Council nor consistently with one's self-respect is cooperation possible with a Government that shows such utter disregard for the opinion of the representatives of the people in the Council Chamber, and for the feelings and sentiments of the people outside.

In my opinion, a Government that passes or sanctions such a law in times of peace forfeits its claim to be called a civilised Government and I still hope that the Secretary of State for India, Mr Montagu will advise His Majesty to signify his disallowance to this Black Act.

Yours truly,
M. A. JINNAH

23

The Indian Khilafat Delegation's Meeting with the British Prime Ministar, Mr Lloyd George, March 19, 1920

Mohammed Ali said the deputation had come chiefly in

connection with a religious question. For the defence of the Faith, the Caliph must always retain adequate territories, naval and military forces, and financial resources. . . . Their first claim, then, was that the Caliphate must be preserved by the entire body of Moslems at all times with adequate power. After the Balkan war particularly, the Empire of the Caliph was reduced to such low limits that Moslems considered the irreducible minimum of temporal power adequate for the defence of the Faith to be the restoration of the territorial *Status quo ante bellum.*

The Prime Minister asked whether the Delegation was opposed to the act of the Syrian Mohammedans, who declared Emir Faisal King of Arabia.

Mohammed Ali: We think this matter can well be left for settlement amongst Moslems.

The Prime Minister: That means that you are opposed to the independence of Arabia?

Mohammed Ali: Yes. Continuing, he said, the Moslems claimed that the local centre of their faith—namely the *Jazirat-ul-Arab*—the "Island of Arabia"—should remain entirely in Moslem control. This was based on the dying injunction of the Prophet himself. . . . Moslems could acquiesce in no form of non-Moslem control, whether in the shape of Mandates or otherwise, over any portion of this region. The religious requirements would be satisfied even if the Emir Feisal exercised independent control there. But since they had to provide sufficient temporal power for the Caliph, the requirments of the utmost economy in their claims suggested that both these requirements might easily be satisfied if the *Jazirat-ul-Arab* remained under the direct sovereignty of the Caliph.

The Prime Minister: I should like to get out of the mind of any Mussulman throughout the Empire that we are treating Turkey upon different principles from those we applied when we came to consider Christian countries. We were at war with three Christian countries and one Mohammedan country. We did not seek war with any of them. The government of Turkey took upon themselves to wage war upon us. . . . So I do not want any Mohammedan in India to imagine that we entered into this war against Turkey as a Crusade against Islam. . . . We are applying the principle of self-determination to those countries which oppressed subject peoples and provoked war to destroy liberty throughout the world. . . . I do not want any Mussulman

in India, therefore, to imagine that we are applying one principle to Christians and another principle to Mohammedans. But neither do I want any Mussalman in India to imagine that we are going to abandon, when we come to Turkey the principles which we have ruthlessly applied to Christian countries like Germany and Austria.

24

Extract from Maulana Mohammad Ali's Presidential Address at the Session of the Indian National Congress, Coconada, 1923, giving his views on Syed Ahmad Khan's Political Stand

Although his own public career after retirment from Public Service was identified with a movement for the uplift of his own community, he was a good Indian as well as a good Muslim, and many of his speeches prove him to have been an ardent patriot inspired with the love of Indian unity. And those who knew him personally can testify to the staunchness of his friendship with many Hindus, which could not have survived the narrow prejudices of which he has sometimes been accused.

No more true is the charge that he was opposed to Muslim participation in politics for all time. Whatever arguments he may have used in the two political utterances to which I have referred, to convince this Muslim hearers, there were two arguments, and two only, that had obviously convinced Syed Ahmad Khan himself of the undesirablility of Muslim participation in the Congress at the time. He realised to the full that nothing would suit the temper of the Muslims of his day better than the vocation of critics of their British supplanters in the governance of India; and he also realised that such a pursuit would be as dangerous to the continuance and progress of a peaceful political movement like the Congress as it was easy. This was the first argument that impelled Syed Ahmad Khan to keep his community under restraint in politics. The second argument was no less potent. The Muslims must educate themselves if they desired the uplift of their community, and yet it was no easy task to reconcile Muslims to Western education even in an institution of their own, which unlike Government colleges and schools, would not divorce religious from secular learning. The easy pursuit of a policy in which the Muslims could act as

destructive critics of the hated infidel Government was sure to offer superior attractions to the dull and drab constructive programme of the educationalist, and he, therefore, set himself to oppose all diversion of Muslim activities into the more attractive, but for the time being less useful, political channel. Reviewing the actions of a bygone generation today when it is easier to be wise after the event, I must confess I still think the attitude of Syed Ahmad Khan was eminently wise, and much as I wish that some things which he had said should have been left unsaid, I am constrainted to admit that no well-wisher of Muslims, nor of India as a whole, could have followed a very different course in leading the Muslims.

Be it remembered that the man who enunciated this policy was not at the time *persona grata* to the major portion of the community which he sought to lead. He was hated as a heretic because of the heterodoxy of his aggressive rationalism in interpreting the Holy Quran, and his militant opposition to popular superstitions believed in by the bulk of the orthodox and to shackling customs consecrated by time, though wholly unauthorised by Islam. He was abused and vilified by hundreds of thousands of his co-religionists, and for long the college that he had founded at Aligarh was the *bete noire* of the pious Muslim. And yet the entire community followed his political lead without a murmur. Neither fallacious arguments nor even political clap-trap could have possessed such potency, and it is my firm belief that his advocacy succeeded mainly because of the soundness of the policy advocated.

25

Extract from Comrade of January 14, 1911 Setting out Maulana Mohammad Ali's views on Nation-Making

"We have no faith," I wrote on January 14, 1911, "in the cry that India is united. If India was united where was the need of dragging the venerable President of this year's Congress from a distant home? The bare imagination of a feast will not dull the edge of hunger. We have less faith still in the sanctimoniousness that transmutes in its subtle alchemy a rapacious monopoly into fervent patriotism.

Even as poor bride deceiv'd with painted grapes
Do surfeit by the eye, and pine the maw.

Those of us who cannot distinguish true gold from the glitter of spurious coins, will one day surfeit by the ear and pine the heart. But the person we love best, fear the most, and trust the least is the impatient idealist. Goethe said of Byron that he was a prodigious poet, but that when he reflected he was a child. Well, we think no better and no worse of the man who combines great ideals and a greater impatience. So many efforts well-meaning as well as ill-begotten, have failed in bringing unity to this distracted land, that we cannot spare even cheap and scentless flowers for the grave of another ill-judged endeavour. We shall not make the mistake of gumming together pieces of broken glass, and then cry over the unsuccessful result, or blame the refractory material. In other words, we shall endeavour to face the situation boldly, and respect facts, howsoever ugly and ill-favoured. It is poor statesmanship to slur over inconvenient realities, and not the least important success in achieving unity is the honest and frank recognition of deep-seated prejudices that hinder it and the yawning differences that divide.

But while providing for today, we must not forget the morrow. It is our firm belief that if the Muslims or the Hindus attempt to achieve success in opposition to or even without the co-operation of one another, they will not only fail, but fail ignominously. But every step has to be taken with caution. Nothing in history, ancient or modern, provides a useful analogy to the condition of modern India. History never repeats itself. But it is still the best educative force for mankind, and it has its lessons for us also. The problems of India are almost international. But when the statesmen and philanthropists of Europe, with all its wars of interests and national jealousies, do not despair of abolishing war and placing Pax on the throne of Bellona, shall we despair of Indian nationality? We may not create today the patriotic fervour and fine national frenzy of Japan with its forty millions of homogeneous people. But a concordat like that of Canada is not beyond the bounds of practicablility. It may not be a love-marriage, born of romance and poetry. But a *marreage de convenance,* honourably cotracted and honourably maintained, is not to be despised. Let us begin with honest prose, and the Muses will not forbid the banns. Even this is no easy task. But it is one worthy of the sons and daughters of India, and deserves their toil and self-sacrifice.

26

Extract from Maulana Mohammad Ali's Presidential Address at the Session of the Indian National Congress, Coconada, 1923, Containing his views on the Revised Creed of the Muslim League

The Muslim League, although never an anti-Hindu or anti-Congress organization, had at its birth in the very midst of the Partition agitation, naturally emphasised in its creed the protection of communal interests and loyalty to Government, even though it had also included therein the promotion of harmony and concord with sister-communities. A year after the Durbar announcement, the Council of the League recommended a change in the creed, and it emphasised in the new creed that it recommended "Self-government suitable for India" as its ideal. In commenting upon this change, which was eventually accepted by the League in its annual session in the following March, I had stated that for the Muslims, their new political creed was but "the half-way house from which their ultimate destination was clearly visible," and I do not think, I can do better in helping you to form a just estimate of our position today than quote from the Comrade of that date the following passage which I would ask all Nationalists, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, to consider carefully:

"But it is not so much on the reform of the administration by the administrators and those to whom they are responsible, nor even on the relationship that comes to exist between the ruler and the ruled that the attainment of self-government depends. Self-government is the necessary corollary of self-realisation, and India as a whole has not yet realised herself. Once her conflicting interests, warring creeds and rival communities not only conceive that India can be one in her soul as she is in her body, but feel her unity as an individual feels the unity of his individual self in spite of the diversity of the various members and organs of his body, and the varying moods of his intellect and soul, there is no power in the world that can deny her self-government. But we would warn our countrymen against playing the sedulous ape in their methods of nation-making as we have warned them in the matter of choosing their political goal . . . . In India political unity can be achieved not so much by annihilating smaller units that may appear to conflict with the ultimate scheme of unity, but by recognising their force and inevitableness. If we could choose a motto for

a society of nation-makers in India, we could suggest nothing better than what the United States of America have adopted. India is to be a pluribus unum".

27

Mr Jinnah's Presidential Address at the Session of the All-India Muslim League, Lahore, May 30, 1924

Since 1920, owing to the most extraordinary and exceptional events which occurred one after the other starting with the passing of the Rowlatt Bill, tragedy of the Punjab and horrors of Amritsar, Treaty of Severes and the Khilafat agitation, the policy and programme of Non-Co-operation enunciated and formulated by Mr Gandhi was the order of the day. The League was not able and not willing to keep abreast of the movement started and first approved of at the Calcutta session of the Indian National Congress and confirmed by the Nagpur Session of December 1920, and had perforce, in view of a very powerful volume of public opinion that rallied round Mr Gandhi's policy and programme, to go into the background. Since the commencement of 1923, it was realised and admitted that the Triple Boycott was a failure, and that the Mass Civil Disobedience could not be undertaken successfully in the near future. Bardoli even was declared by Mr Gandhi as not ready for Mass Civil Disobedience; and even prior to his prosecution and conviction, Mr Gandhi had to resort to what is known as the Bardoli or Constructive Programme. Long before that the Triple Boycott of Law Courts, Schools and Colleges and Councils had failed. The lawyers, barring a few exceptions, did not pay much heed to Mr Gandhi's call and the students, after a first rush of an impulsive character, realised that it was a mistake. Gaya witnessed a struggle in the Congress Camp and Mr Das finally laid the foundation of what has subsequently become and is now known as the Swaraj Party, favouring Council entry. Boycott of Council as desired by Mr Gandhi was far from being effective or useful. Council seats in the country were filled up, the Khilafat organisation which was carried on could notclaim any better position and being the handmaid of the Indian National Congress, it pursued practically the same policy and programme and it succeeded no more or better in giving effect to the programme which it had set up for itself. The Swaraj Party eventually at the Special Session of the Indian National Congress at Delhi in September 1923, prevailed upon and obtained the verdict of the

Indian National Congress to permit those who wished to enter the Legislature, to do so. Whatever may have been the resultant good or evil, I think you will agree with me that we must at this moment make use of the good and forget and discard the evil. It is in this spirit that I wish that we should proceed with our future work. Many mistakes have been made, blunders have been committed, great deal of harm has been done, but there has come out of it a great deal of good also. The result of the struggle of the last three years has this to our credit that there is an open movement for the achievement of Swaraj for India. There is a fearless and persistent demand that steps must be taken for the immediate establishment of Dominion Responsible Government in India. The ordinary man in the street has found his political consciousness and realised that self-respect and honour of the country demand that the Government of the country should not be in the hands of any one else except the people of the country.

But while that demand is a just one and the sentiment only natural and requires every encouragement, we must not forget that one essential requisite condition to achieve Swaraj is the political unity between the Hindus and the Muhammadans; for the advent of foreign rule and its continuance in India is primarily due to the fact that the people of India, particularly the Hindus and Muhammadans, are not united and do not sufficiently trust each other. The domination by the Bureaucracy will continue as long as the Hindus and Muhammadans do not come to a settlement. I am almost inclined to say that India will get Dominion Responsible Government the day the Hindus and Muhammadans are united. Swaraj is almost interchangeable term with Hindu-Muslim unity. If we wish to be free people, let us unite, but if we wish to continue slaves of Bureaucracy, let us fight among ourselves and gratify petty vanity over petty matters, Englishmen being our arbiters.

Gentlemen, I quoted in my speech at the Muslim League Session in 1916 from the speech of Mr Lloyd George which will, I think, bear repetition and if you will permit me, I will quote Lloyd George said: He was convinced now that it was misunderstanding, partly racial, partly religious. It was to the interest of both to have it removed. But there seemed to have been some evil chance that frustrated every effort made for the achievement of better relations. He had tried once but did not succeed. But the fault was not entirely on one side. He had felt the whole time that they were moving in an atmosphere of nervous suspicion and distrust, pervasive and universal of everything and everybody.

He was drenched with suspicion of Irishmen by Englishmen and of Englishmen by Irishmen and worse and most fatal of all, by the suspicion of Irishmen. It was quagmire of distrust which clogged the foot-steps of progress. That was the real enemy of Ireland. If that could be slain, he believed, it would accomplish an act of reconciliation that would make Ireland greater and Britain greater and would make the United Kingdom and the Empire greater than they ever were before.

This quotation, gentlemen, applied to the situation in Ireland in 1916. They apply to India today if the words were transposed and instead of "Irishmen" and "Englishmen" you were to substitute "Hindus" and "Muhammadans". But it applies no longer to Ireland. Ireland has since attained her freedom and we are still continuing our quarrels. It is for you who come here from all parts of India to devise ways and means and find a solution for the greatest enemy of India—the differences between the Hindus and Muhammadans. I have no doubt that if the Hindus and Muhammadans make a wholehearted and earnest effort, we shall be able to find a solution once more as we did at Lucknow in 1916. It is only then that India, united and strong, will be able to really galvanise the British Parliament and the British Nation into action and force their hands to grant Dominion Responsible Government to India. In the case of Ireland and Egypt, mark how they have extorted their freedom from the hands of the British Parliament and the British Nation.

But while that is the main goal, upon which must be concentrated the best efforts, the energy and the intellect of the country, we must, in the meanwhile, promote, support and advance the commercial, industrial and agricultural progress and welfare in all their varied activities in the country and strive to get a sound system of finance and currency. We must take steps to organize labour in the country, industrial as well as agricultural, including ryots and peasants, to bring about speedy improvement in their economic condition and protect their interests. We must enable them to take their place in their country's struggle for Swaraj. We must teach them to take their proper share in the constitution of Dominion Responsible Government of India. We must not lose any opportunity to promote and advance mass education so as to make the elementary education universal and thus dispel the ignorance and darkness and bring light to millions of our countrymen who cannot claim even three R's. We must take steps, if necessary, to see that elementary education is made compulsory. We should, as far as possible, organise and devise means for the

purpose of encouraging and establishing Swadeshi industries and manufacture, promoting National Education, removing untouchability and encouraging settlement of disputes by arbitration. There are many other vital and important questions, administrative or otherwise, such as, Railways, Indianisation of and raising the National Army, Indianisation of Services, organising and instructing electorates, and supporting candidates for Legislatures, local or central, at the elections. All these questions can be dealt with partly by educative propaganda throughout the country and partly through and by means of existing Legislatures. While we unflinchingly and with all our might and main support the demand for reforms, provided the rights and interests of the minorities in any existing scheme or in any scheme of advance will be duly protected and safeguarded, yet we cannot associate ourselves with any policy of deliberate and wanton wreckage or destruction. We ought to be prepared, if the Government do not make satisfactory response to the National demand for Reforms, as a last resort to make the Government by Legislature or through Legislature impossible and we should, if necessary, adopt for that purpose all means and measures to bring about parliamentary obstruction and constitutional deadlocks. But in the meantime, we must extract all the good we can from the Government by and through the Legislature by means of such limited powers and influence as is permitted to us to exercise within the scope of the Government of India Act, 1919, as it is constituted today.

The Khilafat question has for the moment, owing to the recent decisions of Angora Assembly under the guidance and leadership of Mustafa Kamal Pasha and Ismet Pasha, taken such a turn that no immediate solution can be suggested. But let us hope that a Congress of the Mussalmans of the world, which is in contemplation, will have, when it meets, in its midst all those most qualified and competent to speak on the question, and the united wisdom of those learned in the Law and Religion of Islam will find a solution of what at present appears to be one of the most amazingly complicated questions.

Then there remains the question of Swaraj. Thus the immediate issue between India and Great Britain of paramount magnitude and importance is the amendment of the constitution of the Government of India. The Assembly passed a resolution last February (1924) by the vote of 76 representatives against 48 recommending to the Gevernor-General in Council to take immediate steps to establish full Responsible Government in India. The Government only showed its willingness to move by

means of a departmental committee to inquire into the defects in the working of the Act of 1919 and further to inquire whether any advance should be made within the Rule-making power—but refused to commit itself with regard to the necessity of amending the Act, except to rectify any administrative imperfection. So we ask for bread and the Government is offering us stone. Surely the position is so manifestly unjust and untenable that it cannot be maintained long. For, is it claimed that the question as to Provincial Autonomy to be granted to the Provinces and introduction of responsibility in the Central Government cannot be even considered until the expiration of ten years' period contemplated by the Act? Is it possible in view of the universal opinion throughout the country to the contrary to work the reforms such as they are without further advance until 1929? The Statute noes not bar an inquiry being undertaken at any time as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of Responsible Government or to extend the degree of Responsible Government:

After outlining the present system of Government of India, Mr M.A. Jinnah then pointed out its defects and how unworkable it had become and proceeded.

"Is it possible, therefore, to allow the present position to continue? I feel that the situation is far too serious and I hope that the Government has already realised it and will not allow any further delay, which, in my opinion, would be dangerous, but meet the universal demand which is being voiced from a thousand platforms all over the country that immediate steps must be taken to scrap the present constitution and devise a constitution in consultation with the representatives of the people which will give them a real control and responsibility over their affairs and full scope for development of all their resources and enable them to stand as free people under the full-fledged Dominion Responsible Government amongst the ranks of the Nations of the world. This the task before the All-India Muslim League and the country at large. I, therefore, earnestly appeal and pray to my countrymen to unite and organise all the resources of our country for the attainment of our immediate goal—that is, freedom for India."

28

Resolutions Passed at the fifteenth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Lahore, May 25, 1924

Whereas the speedy attainment af Swaraj is one of the declared objects of the All-India Muslim League and whereas it is now generally felt that the conception of Swaraj should be translated into the realm of concrete politics and become a factor in the daily life of the Indian people, the All-India Muslim League hereby resolves, that in any scheme of a constitution for India, that may ultimately be agreed upon and accepted by the people, the following shall constitute its basic and fundamental principles:

(*a*) The existing provinces of India shall all be united under a common government on a federal basis, so that each province shall have full and complete provincial autonomy, the functions of the Central Government being confined to such matters only as are of general and common concern.

(*b*) Any territorial redistribution that might at any time become necessary, shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority of population in the Punjab, Bengal and N.-W.F. Province.

(*c*) The mode of representation in the Legislature and in all other elected bodies shall guarantee adequate and effective representation to minorities in every province, subject, however, to the essential proviso that no majority shall be reduced to a minority or even to an equality.

(*d*) Full religious liberty, i.e. liberty of belief, worship, observances, propaganda, association, and education shall be guaranteed to all communities.

(*e*) The idea of joint electorates with a specified number of seats being unacceptable to Indian Muslims, on the ground of its being a fruitful source of discord and disunion and also of being wholly inadequate to achieve the object of effective representation of various communal groups, the representation of the latter shall

continue to be by means of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its Separate Electorate in favour of Joint Electorate.

(*f*) No bill or resolution or any part thereof affecting any community, which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the elected body concerned, shall be passed in any legislature or in any other elected body, if three-fourths of the members of that community in that particular body oppose such bill or resolution or part thereof.

That in the opinion of the All-India Muslim League, the reforms granted by the Government of India Act, 1919 are wholly unsatisfactory and altogether inadequate to meet the requirement of the country and that the virtual absence of any responsibility of the executive to the elected representatives of the people in the legislature has really rendered them futile and unworkable: the League, therefore, urges that immediate steps be taken to establish Swaraj, i.e. full responsible government; this, in the opinion of the League can only be done by a complete overhaul of the Government of India Act, 1919 and not merely by an enquiry with a view to discover defects in the working of the Act and to rectify imperfections under its rule-marking power.

The All-India Muslim League deplores the present scandalous state of disorganization existing among the Muslims in all spheres of life, which not only prevents all healthy interchange of ideas and co-operation for the good of the community, but also seriously handicaps the Muslims in shouldering their proper share of responsibility in the national struggle for progress and self-Government: the League, therefore, urges the extreme desirability of concerted action everywhere with a view to secure internal solidarity among the Mussalmans of India and resolves that a committee be formed to carry out a programme of political, social and economic development with particular reference to the following items:

(1) To popularise the League and establish its Provincial, District, Tehsil, Pargana and Village Branches throughout India.

(2) To collect funds for the League.

(3) To call upon and co-operate with the Muslim Educational Conference in India in establishing elementary schools in every village and utilising the village Mosques and

Imams for this purpose wherever feasible.

(4) To promote female education among the Mussalmans and to establish schools for the purpose in villages and towns.

(5) To encourage adult education.

(6) To organize the Muslim boy scout movement.

(7) To encourage the use of Khaddar and Swadeshi goods.

(8) To encourage and help the establishment of Muslim Banks in the country.

29

Resolutions Passed at the Sixteenth Annual Session of the All India Muslim League, Bombay, 30 & 31 December, 1924

That the All-India Muslim League strongly urges upon the Government the immediate and paramount necessity of introducing reforms in the N.-W.F. Province and of placing that province in all respects in a position of equality with the other major provinces of India.

That the All-India Muslim League is firmly of opinion that anarchical organizations can never secure Swaraj to the people of India, and while disapproving and condeming most emphatically such organizations, if any, the All-India Muslim League views with the strongest disapproval, the action of the Governor-General in promulgating the Criminal Law Amendment, Ordinance of 1924, as such extraordinary measure, being a direct invasion upon individual liberty, should not have been enacted without the sanction of the Legislature and as it easily lends itself, in the hands of the Executive, to grave abuses resulting in implicating innocent persons and in interfering with constitutional political activity, as past experience of similar measures has repeatedly demonstrated. The League, therefore, urges the immediate withdrawal of the Ordinance and the trial, if necessary, in accordance with the ordinary law, of the persons detained under it, and the League further urges that Regulation III of 1818 which gives the Government powers of arresting and confining persons suspected of public crimes, without warrant, without trial and without statement of reasons for such arrest and confinement, should be forthwith withdrawn, and it records its conviction that the present political situation in India is due to the denial of the just rights of the people long overdue and

that the speedy establishment of Swaraj is the only effective remedy therefor.

30

Resolutions Passed at the Seventeenth Annual Session of the All-Indla Muslim League, Aligarh, 30 & 31 December, 1925

That whereas the speedy attainment of full responsible government is one of the declared objects of the League and it is now generally felt and recognised that the conception of Swaraj should be translated into the realm of practical politics.

And whereas it is the declared policy of the British Government also to enable the people of India to take a decisive part in the moulding of their own destinies which is marked by the declaration of August, 1917 and the enactment of 1919 which formed a definite epoch in the history of India as a herald of the time when India will possess full autonomy and will rank as an equal with the Dominions and with the United Kingdom itself as a member of the British Commonwealth.

The All-India Muslim League is of opinion that the present constitution of India must be amended, and urges that for this purpose, the Government should undertake the revision of the Government of India Act, 1919 and without any delay appoint a Royal Commission to formulate after due enquiry and investigation, a scheme so as to place the Indian constitution on a sound and permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress to establish full responsible Government in India and thereby secure stability in the Government, and the willing co-operation of the people:

Provided, however, that for any scheme of the future constitution of India, the All-India Muslim League reaffirms and unequivocally declares that the following basic and fundamental principles must be secured and guaranteed, viz.

(1) All legislatures of the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even to an equality.

(2) The representation of communal groups shall continue

to be, by means of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate.

(3) Any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and North-West Frontier Province.

(4) Full religious liberty, i.e. liberty of belief, worship, observances, propaganda, association and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities.

(5) No bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or in any other elected body, if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such bill or resolution or part thereof on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community, or in the alternative such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable, to deal with such cases.

That, whereas, there is no ground, ethnological, geographical or otherwise, for the inclusion of Sind with in the Presidency of Bombay and whereas past experience has shown that such inclusion is in the highest degree detrimental to the best interest of the people of Sind and to the development of that part of India, the all-India Muslim League is of opinion that Sind should be separated from Bombay and constituted into a separate province.

31

Resolutions Passed at the Eighteenth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 29-31 December, 1926

That the All-India Muslim League regrets that the Government have not as yet taken any action regarding the question of reforms to be introduced in the North-Western Frontier Province, in spite of repeated demands of the Mussalmans of India for several years and the considered opinion of the Legislative Assembly embodied in its resolution which was carried in March 1926 without a division. The League urges once more that it is now high time that the Government should give effect to the recommendation of the Majority Report of the Bray Committee and thus allay the feelings and misapprehensions of the Mussalmans not only of N.-W.F.P. but of all India, regarding this matter.

That whereas, the speedy attainment of full responsible Government is one of the declared objects of the League and it is now generally felt and recognized that the conception of Swaraj should be translated into the realm of practical politics,

And whereas, it is the declared policy of the British Government also to enable the people of India to take a decisive part in the moulding of their own destinies which is marked by the declaration of August 1917 and the enactment of 1919 which formed a definite epoch in the history of India as a herald of the time when India will possess full autonomy and will rank as an equal with the Dominions and with the United Kingdom itself as a member of the British Commonwealth,

The All-India Muslim League is of opinion that the present constitution of India must be amended, and urges that for this purpose the Government should undertake the revision of the Government of India Act, 1919 and without any delay appoint a Royal Commission to formulate, after due enquiry and investigation, a scheme so as to place the Indian constitution on a sound and permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress to establish full responsible Government in India and thereby secure stability in the Government, and the willing co-operation of the people:

Provided, however, that for any scheme of the future constitution of Indian the All-India Muslim League reaffirms and unequivocally declares that the following basic and fundamental principles must be secured and guaranteed, viz.

(1) All legislatures of the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even to an equality.

(2) The representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate.

(3) Any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary, shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and North-West Frontier Province.

(4) Full religious liberty, i.e. liberty of belief, worship, observances, propaganda, association and education shall be guaranteed to all communities.

(5) No bill or resolution or any part thereof, shall be passed in any legislature or in any other elected body, if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such bill or resolution or part thereof, on the ground that it would be injurious to the interest of that community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable, to deal with such cases.

32

Proposals for Hindu-Muslim settlement popularly known as Delhi Muslim Proposals evolved at a conference of Muslim leaders of different shades of opinion, held at Delhi under the presidentship of Mr M. A. Jinnah, 20 March, 1927

Whether in the forthcoming revision of the Indian constitution, elections to legislative bodies should be through joint or separate electorates has been the subject of anxious discussion among Hindu and Mussalman leaders in Delhi. The Hindu members of the Congress Party and the Nationalist Party, having already decided in favour of only a joint electorate with the reservation of seats to Mohammedans, either on the basis of the Lucknow Pact or the existing population of each province, the Mussalmans met in informal conference today under the Presidentship of Mr Jinnah, who had issued invitations to representative Mussalmans in all parts of India.

After a protracted discussion, the conference agreed to the institution of joint electorates under certain conditions. It was unanimously resolved that the Mohammedans should accept a settlement on the basis of the following, so far as representation in the various legislatures in any future scheme of constitution is concerned:

(1) Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency and constituted into a separate province.

(2) Reforms should be introduced in the North-West Frontier Province and in Baluchistan on the same footing as in any other province in India.

If this is agreed to, Mussalmans are prepared to accept a joint electorate in all provinces so constituted and are further willing to make to Hindu minorities in Sind, Baluchistan and the

North-West Frontier Province, the same concessions that Hindu majorities in other provinces are prepared to make to Muslim minorities.

In the Punjab and Bengal the proportion of representation should be in accordance with population.

In the Central Legislature, Muslim representation shall not be less than one-third, and that also by a mixed electorate.

These proposals are subject to ratification by the Muslim organizations concerned, but it was hoped by those present at the conference that the Hindus would accept and the Mussalmans would ratify them.

The question of the Services and other questions with regard to safeguards concerning any bill or resolution which might affect the religion, or the customs or the usages of either community, or affecting inter-communal interests were also discussed by the meeting, but postponed for further consideration and will be taken up, if on the main proposition there can be unanimity of opinion.

33

Resolution passed at the nineteenth annual session of the All India Muslim League, Calcutta, 30 & 31 December 1927 and 1st January, 1928

That the All-India Muslim League emphatically declares that the Statutory Commission and the procedure as announced are unacceptable to the people of India. It, therefore, resolves that Mussalmans throughout the country should have nothing to do with the Commission at any stage or in any form.

The All-India Muslim League authorises the Muslim League Council to appoint a sub-Committee to confer with the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress and such other organizations, as they think proper, for the purpose of drafting a constitution for India in which the interests of the Muslim community will be safeguarded, having regard to the following proposals which the League approves of and adopts, and subsequently take part in the National Convention which is going to take place in Delhi in March next as suggested by the Congress:

(1) That Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency and constituted into a separate province;

(2) That reforms should be introduced in the North-Western

Frontier Province and in Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces;

(3) That in the present circumstances the representation of Muslims in the different Legislatures of the country through separate Muslim electorates is inevitable, and that Muslims will not accept any scheme involving the surrender of this valued right, unless and until Sind is actually made a separate province and the Reforms aforesaid are actually introduced in the North-Western Frontier and Baluchistan Provinces, and that when these requirements are fully satisfied, Muslims will be prepared to abandon separate electorates in favour of joint electorates with reservation of seats fixed on the basis of the population of the different communities, subject to what is related hereinafter;

(4) In Sind, Baluchistan and the North-Western Frontier Provinces, the Muslim majority should make the same concession in regard to proportion of the seats reserved to the Hindu minority that Hindu majorities in other Provinces would make to Muslim minorities over and above the proportion of the population of the Provinces which shall be the minimum basis; and

(5) In the Central Legislature, the Muslim representation shall not be less than one-third.

The League further resolves: (*a*) that in the future constitution of India, liberty of conscience shall be guaranteed, and no legislature, Central or Provincial, shall have power to make any laws interfering with the liberty of conscience. "Liberty of conscience" means liberty of belief and worship, freedom of religious observances and association, and freedom to carry on religious education and propaganda with due regard to the feelings of others and without interfering with similar rights of others; (*b*) that no bill, resolution, motion or amendment regarding intercommunal matters shall be moved, discussed or passed in any legislature, Central or Provincial, if a three-fourths majority of the members of the community affected thereby in that legislature, oppose the introduction, discussion or passing of such bill, resolution, motion or amendment. "Inter-communal matters" means matters agreed upon as such by the joint standing committee of both communities of the Hindu and Muslim members of the legislatures concerned, appointed at the commencement of every session of that legislature.

This League resolves that without prejudice to the rights

that the Hindus and the Mussalmans claim, the one to play music and conduct processions wherever they please, and the other to slaughter cows for sacrifice or food wherever they please, the Mussalmans appeal to the Mussalmans to spare Hindu feelings as much as possible in the matter of cow slaughter, and trust that the Hindus will appeal to the Hindus to spare Mussalman feelings as much as possible in the matter of music before mosques, and this League calls upon both the Hindus and the Mussalman not to have recourse to violence or to law to prevent the slaughter of a cow or the playing of music before mosques.

This League further resolves that every individual or group is at liberty to convert or reconvert another by argument or pursuation, but that no individual or group shall attempt to do so or prevent its being done by force, fraud or other unfair means, such as the offering of material inducement. Persons under eighteen years of age should not be converted unless it be along with their parents or guardians. If any person under eighteen years of age is found stranded without his parents or guardian by persons of another faith, he should be promptly handed over to persons of his own faith. There must be no secrecy at to the person, place, time and manner about any conversion or reconversion, nor should there be any demonstration or jubilation in support of any conversion or any reconversion. Wherever any complaint is made in respect of any conversion or reconversion that it was effected in secrecy or by force, fraud or other unfair means, or wherever any person under eighteen years of age is converted, the matter shall be enquired into and decided by arbitrators appointed jointly by the two communities.

34

Resolution passed at the twentieth annual session of the All-India Muslim League, Calcutta, 26 to 30 December, 1928

That the following gentlemen be appointed delegates to represent the League at and take part in the deliberations of the Convention called by the Indian National Congress. These delegates will take into careful consideration and attach due weight to the views on the communal question expressed in the Subjects Committee and the open Session of the League, and will endeavour to bring about an adjustment of the various

outstanding questions between Hindus and Mussalmans arising out of the Nehru Report.

These delegates will report the result of their labour to the League by 28th or 29th instant for the League to take its decision thereon.

(1) The Maharajah of Mahmoodabad, (2) Mr M.A. Jinnah, (3) Dr Saifuddin Kitchlew, (4) M.C. Chagla, (5) Malik Barkat Ali, (6) Maulvi Abdul Hamid, (7) Maulvi Mujeebur Rahman, (8) Dr Syed Mahmood, (9) Maulvi Hissamuddin, (10) Maulvi Mohammad Akram Khan, (11) Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, (12) Seth Yakub Hasan, (13) Ghazi Abdur Rahman, (14) Abdullah Barailvi, (15) Tassaduq Ahmad Khan Sherwani, (16) Choudhri Khaliquzzaman, (17) Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, (18) Maulvi Mazhar Ali, (19) Shah Mohammad Zubair, (20) Maulvi Abdul Karim, (21) Maulvi Mohammad Aslam, (22) Maulvi Azizul Haq and (23) Maulvi Faiznoor Ali.

35

Resolution passed at the All-Parties Muslim Conferenre, held at Delhi under the presidentship of H.H. the Aga Khan, 1st January 1929

Whereas, in view of India's vast extent and its ethnological, linguistic, administrative and geographical or territorial divisions, the only form of Government suitable to Indian conditions is a federal system with complete autonomy and residuary powers vested in the constituent States, the Central Government having control only of such matters of common interest as may be specifically entrusted to it by the Constitution;

And whereas it is essential that no Bill, resolution, motion, or amendment regarding inter-communal matters be moved, discussed or passed by any legislature, central or provincial, if a three-fourth majority of the members of either the Hindu or the Muslim community affected thereby in that legislature oppose the introduction, discussion or passing of such Bill, resolution, motion, or amendments;

And whereas the right of Muslims to elect their representatives on the various Indian Legislatures through separate electorates is now the law of the land and Muslims cannot be deprived of that right without their consent;

And whereas in the conditions existing at present in India

and so long as those conditions continue to exist, representation in various Legislatures and other statutory self-government bodies of Muslims through their own separate electorates is essential in order to bring into existence a really representative democratic Government;

And whereas as long as Mussalmans are not satisfied that their rights and interests are adequately safeguarded in the constitution, they will in no way consent to the establishment of joint electorates, whether with or without conditions;

And whereas for the purposes aforesaid, it is essential that Mussalmans should have their due share in the central and provincial cabinets;

And whereas it is essential that representation of Mussalmans in the various legislatures and other statutory self-governing bodies should be based on a plan whereby the Muslim majority in those provinces where Mussalmans constitute a majority of population shall in no way be affected and in the provinces in which Mussalmans constitute a minority they shall have a representation in no case less than that enjoyed by them under the existing law;

And whereas representative Muslim gatherings in all provinces in India have unanimously resolved that with a view to provide adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim interests in India as a whole, Mussalmans should have the right of 33 per cent representation in the Central Legislature and this Conference entirely endorses that demand;

And whereas on ethnological, linguistic, geographical and administrative grounds the province of Sind has no affinity whatever with the rest of the Bombay Presidency and its unconditional constitution into a separate province, possessing its own separate legislative and administrative machinery on the same lines as in other provinces of India, is essential in the interests of its people, the Hindu minority in Sind being given adequate and effective representation in excess of their proportion in the population, as may be given to Mussalmans in provinces in which they constitute a minority of population;

And whereas the introduction of constitutional reforms in the N.-W.F. Province and Baluchistan along such lines as may be adopted in other provinces of India is essential not only in the interests of those provinces but also of the constitutional advance of India as a whole, the Hindu minorities in those provinces being given adequate and effective representation in

excess of their proportion in population, as is given to the Muslim community in provinces in which it constitutes a minority of the population;

And whereas it is essential in the interests of Indian administration that provision should be made in the constitution giving Muslims their adequate share along with other Indians in all services of the State and on all statutory self-governing bodies, having due regard to the requirements of efficiency;

And whereas having regard to the political conditions obtaining in India, it is essential that the Indian Constitution should embody adequate safeguards for protection and promotion of Muslim education, languages, religion, personal law and Muslim charitable institutions, and for their due share in grants-in-aid;

And whereas it is essential that the constitution should provide that no change in the Indian constitution shall, after its inauguratinon, be made by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of all the States constituting the Indian federation;

This Conference emphatically declares that no constitution, by whomsoever proposed or devised, will be acceptable to Indian Mussalmans unless it conforms with the principles embodied in this resolution.

36

Mr M. A. Jinnah's speech on the Nehru Committee's recommendations regarding the future constitution and Hindu-Muslim problem at the All-Parties Convention, Calcutta, December, 1928

Mr Chairman and Delegates,

The Report of the Committee which you appointed has already been read out and placed before you. I am exceedingly sorry that the Report of the Committee is neither helpful nor fruitful in any way whatsoever. I am sure, gentlemen, that you all realise that the present moment is very critical and vital to the interest not only of the Mussalmans, but to the whole of India. I think it will be recognised that it is absolutely essential to our progress that Hindu-Muslim settlement should be reached, and that all communities should live in a friendly and harmonious spirit in this vast country of ours. No country has succeeded in

either wresting a democratic constitution from the domination of another nation or establishing representative institutions from within without giving guarantees for the security of the minorities, wherever such a problem has arisen. Majorities are apt to be oppressive and tyrannical and minorities always dread and fear that their interests and rights, unless clearly and definitely safe-guarded by statutory provisions, would suffer and be prejudiced, but this apprehension is enhanced all the more when we have to deal with communal majority. I am sure, you will, therefore, consider the present situation in which we are working and struggling for freedom and record your vote in favour of modifications proposed; which, as I have said before, are fair and reasonable and thus enable us to triumph in our cause.

The first point that I want to place before you, is a point with regard to our proposal that there should be no less than 1/3rd Muslim representation in the Central Legislature. We propose that 1/3rd of the elected members of the Central Legislature should be the Mussalmans, and that the seats should be reserved for them to that extent in the joint electorates of the country. Now the Nehru Report has stated that according to the scheme which they have formulated, the Mussalmans are likely to get 1/3rd in the Central Legislature and more. It is argued there that the Punjab and Bengal will get many more seats over and above their population and the other minorities Provinces in India will get the representation of the Mussalmans according to their population under the scheme propounded by the Nehru Report. What we feel is this. If it is conceded that Mussalmans should be enabled to secure one-third of the representation in the Central Legislature, the method which is adopted is neither quite fair to the provinces where the Mussalmans are in a minority, nor does it guarantee that we shall obtain 1/3rd representation in the Central Legislature. Therefore, the two Mussalmans majority provinces—Punjab and Bengal—will get more than their population, which means you are giving more to the rich who will, under normal conditions, get the largest number of Muslim representatives and you are depriving the Muslim minority Provinces of great importance, and restricting them to get no more than their population, whereas we wish to restrict the Punjab and Bengal according to their population and desire that the excess should be distributed amongst the minority Muslim Provinces. In other words, we propose that let us carve out of this 1/3rd as the Mussalmans wish. Take the case of Madras and Bombay—it is not always the only criterion,

viz., counting of heads, but the importance of those two Provinces. Take the case of the United Provinces again, it is the centre of the Mussalman culture and heart and it will be unfair that they should be restricted according to the number of their population in their representation in the Central Legislature. These three Provinces, Sind being separated, will then, so far as the population goes, be in this position, the United Provinces with the 14 per cent. The method that we want to be adopted is that the excess between 1/3rd and 1/4th should be distributed amongst the other Provinces according to the relative position of their importance to the Mussalmans and not according to population. I am sure indeed that besides counting of heads, there are otheir weighty and important considerations, which must not be lost sight of. It is not only a question of getting votes in the Legislature, but it is also essential that various parts of the Provinces which are themselves vast, should be represented, so that, questions affecting the people of their grievances may be ventilated properly and thoroughly on the floor of the Legislature. Very often when proper facts and arguments are placed by one single representative which, when they are convincing, sway the entire legislature. It really comes to this that the Nehru Report makes a gift of the extra seats over and above the population basis to the Punjab and Bengal, whereas, we propose that this extra 7 or 8 per cent seats should be distributed amongst the minority Muslim Provinces.

Our next proposal is that in the event of the adult suffrage not being established, Punjab and Bengal also should have seats reserved on population basis for the Mussalmans. But they should not have the right to contest for more, of course, subject to re-examination of the question at the end of ten years. I am not sure that establishment of adult suffrage is within the range of practical politics in the near future. You remember, originally the proposal emanated from certain Muslim Leaders in March 1927, known as the Delhi Muslim Proposals. That was dealt with by the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay and in the open session of the Madras Congress and endorsed by them. The Muslim League at its Calcutta Session in December 1927, also confirmed the proposals. I am not going to enter into the pros and cons, but it is an admitted fact that although the Mussalmans in the Punjab and Bengal are numerically in the majority, their voting strength is far below in proportion to their population, and they, therefore, would not secure sufficient representation and it is feared that under those circumstances, their representation will be far below their population. It is

now devised to meet this undoubted fact by the Nehru proposals and the Report proposes the substitute of adult franchise and from those premises, it is argued that there is no need for reservation in Punjab and Bengal; but we wish to provide for the contingency which is most patent and probable that in the event of the adult suffrage not being established, there should be reservation for Mussalmans in Punjab and Bengal according to their population, but they should not be entitled to additional seats. And we, therefore, attach very great importance to this modification.

Our next proposal is that the form of the constitution should be federal with residuary powers vesting in the Provinces and Clause 13A in the Supplementary Nehru Report is most pernicious and should be deleted and the whole constitution should be revised on the basis of Provincial Governments having the residuary powers vested in them, and subject to that there should be revision of the schedules laying down central and provincial subjects as embodied in the Nehru Report. This question is by far the most important from the constitutional point of view and the future development of India and has very little to do with the communal aspect. If this question is examined carefully, it has much less of communal bearing and far graver of general interest of India and the future constitutional progress of the people of India.

This is hardly a place or an occasion when you would expect me to enter into a debate which might be held between two jurists. We have carefully considered the matter and we have come to the conclusion that a system which will give residuary powers to the Provinces, is the most suited for the Federation of India.

With regard to the question of separation of Sind and the N.-W.F. Province, we cannot agree that they should await until the Nehru Constitution is established with adult suffrage. Do you expect the Mussalmans to oppose the reform being introduced in the N.-W.F. Province until the Nehru Constitution is established? I am somewhat amazed that the Committee appointed by the Convention has rejected these proposals on the ground that a resolution was passed at Lucknow which recorded an agreement arrived at by certain individuals, who were parties to that agreement and signed it and, therefore, they cannot re-open the question. The All-India Muslim League was not a party to any such resolution and was not represented at that meeting. I say with the utmost deference to the Members of the

Committee that this is not a valid ground or answer. There are many organizations present here in the Convention today, none of them is bound by any such agreements arrived at between individuals or groups. I venture to say that this Convention is not bound and it is wholly untenable to advance any such reason before this Convention. This Convention is entitled to make any change, or alteration or modification in the proposals now before it, and I ask the Convention whether the separation of Sind and the introduction of reforms in the N.-W.F. Province are only to be accepted when the Nehru Constitution with adult suffrage is brought into full effect and operation in this country. The Mussalmans feel that it is shelving the issue and postponing their insistent demand till doomsday and cannot agree to it. I, therefore, appeal to the Convention to take all these matters into their careful consideration and meet us.

Replying to the debate Mr Jinnah said:

Sir,

The reason why no other delegate from the Muslim League was going to take part in the debate is that we have come to the Convention, which is composed of something like 1,200 delegates not with a purpose of raising controversies which would lead to bad feelings. We have already placed our proposals before the Convention and our grounds for supporting them and on the hypothesis which must be admitted on all hands that communalism exists in this country. We have not come here to apportion blame for it. The offensive remarks or insinuations serve no good purpose and I will not follow the style or the manner of the speech delivered by my friend, Mr Jayakar. Nor will I on this occasion permit myself to deal with specious arguments and pleadings which he has advanced. In short, his position is an ultimatum and with that ultimatum we were made aware from the very start on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha. If a single word with regard to the communal settlement is changed in the report, they will withdraw their support to it. With regard to the remarks of my friend, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, I am afraid some of the speakers have misunderstood them. He called me a spoilt child. I know the spirit in which he meant it and others have put a childish interpretation upon it. But I think, it cannot be denied and I hope that Mr Jayakar and others will agree with me that every country struggling for freedom and desirous of establishing a democratic system of Government has had to face the problem of minorities wherever

they existed and no constitution, however idealistic it may be, and, however perfect from theoretical point of view it may seem, will ever receive the support of the minorities, unless they can feel that they, as an entity, are secured under the proposed constitution and government, and whether a constitution will succeed or not must necessarily depend as a matter of acid test whether the minorities are in fact secure. Otherwise no proper constitution will last, but result in a revolution and civil war. I must here point out that it is not correct to say that the Muslim League did not take part at all in the All-Parties Conference. The Council of the League had appointed a Committee in February 1928 and it attended the All-Parties Conference till the 11th of March and the Committee had express instructions not to proceed with the framing of any constitution until the Hindu-Muslim differenences were adjusted and agreed upon. It is true that no settlement was reached and as the Committee felt that it was not possible to arrive at any agreement, they ceased to take further part in the All-Parties Conference which is responsible for producing the Nehru Report. I am not here today to express my opinion as to whether a constitution ought to be framed or not, but I would ask Mr Jayakar to consider whether he wants what he calls the greatest common measure of agreement to be still greater or not. We are engaged today in a very serious and solemn transaction. It is not merely for the various organizations to come here and say, we agree to it, and retire. We are here, as I understand, for the purpose of entering into solemn contract and all parties who enter into it will have to work for it and fight for it together. What we want, is that the Hindus and Mussalmans should march together until our object is obtained. Therefore, it is essential that you must get not only the Muslim League but the Mussalmans of India and here I am not speaking as a Mussalman but as an Indian. And it is my desire to see that we get 7 crores of Mussalman to march along with us in the struggle for freedom. Would you be content with a few? Would you be content if I were to say, I am with you? Do you want or do you not want Muslim India to go along with you? You must remember two major communities in India—I say this without the slightest disrespect to other communities like Sikhs, Christians and Parsis—are the Hindus and Mussalmans and naturally, therefore, these two communities have got to be reconciled and united and made to feel that their interests are common and they are marching together for a common goal. I want you, therefore, to rise to that statesmanship which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru describes. Minorities cannot

give anything to the majority. It is, therefore, no use asking me not to press for what you call these small points. I am not asking for these modifications because I am a naughty child. If they are small points why not concede? It is up to the majority and the majority alone can give. I am asking you for this adjustment, because I think it is the best and fair to the Mussalmans. Look at the constitutional history of Canada and Egypt. The minorities are always afraid of majorities. The majorities are apt to be tyrannical and oppressive and particularly religious majorities and the minorities, therefore, have a right to be absolutely secured. Was the adjustment between French Canadians and British arrived at on population basis or on the ground of pure equity? Was the adjustment between the Copts, Christians and Mussalmans in Egypt regulated by such considerations? We are dealing with politics. We are not in a Court of Law and, therefore, it is no use resorting to hair-splitting and petty squabbles. These are big questions and they can be settled only by the exercise of the highest order of statesmanship and political wisdom. I, therefore, ask you once more to consider this question most carefully before you decide. Please don't think that in anything that I have said, I am threatening any party and I hope that I shall not be misunderstood. If you do not settle this question today, we shall have to settle it tomorrow, but in the meantime our national interests are bound to suffer. We are all sons of this land. We have to live together. We have to work together and whatever our differences may be, let us at any rate not create more bad blood. If we cannot agree, let us at any rate agree to differ, but let us part as friends. I once more repeat. Believe me, there is no progress for India until the Mussalmans and Hindus are united and let no logic, philosophy or squabble stand in the way of our coming to a compromise nnd nothing will make me more happy than to see the Hindu-Muslim Union.

37

Draft Resolution prepared by Mr M. A. Jinnah representing consensus of opinion between different schools of Muslim political thought (popularly known as Fourteen Points)

The League after anxious and careful consideration, most earnestly and emphatically lays down that no scheme for the future constitution of the government of India will be accept-

able to Mussalmans of India until and unless the following basic principles are given effect to and provisions are embodied therein to safeguared their rights and interests:

(1) The form of the future constitution should be federal, with the residuary powers vested in the provinces.

(2) A uniform measure of autonomy shall be granted to all provinces.

(3) All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every Province without reducing the majority in any Province to a minority or even equality.

(4) In the Central Legislature, Mussalman repesentation shall not be less than one-third.

(5) Representation of communal groups shall continue to be, by means of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community, at any time, to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate.

(6) Any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way, affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and N.-W.F. Province.

(7) Full religious liberty, i.e. liberty of belief, worship and observance, propaganda, association and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities.

(8) No bill or resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or any other elected body if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such a bill, resolution or part thereof, on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.

(9) Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.

(10) Reforms should be introduced in the N.-W.F. Province and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces.

(11) Provision should be made in the constitution giving Moslems an adequate share along with the other Indians, in all the services of the State and in local self-governing bodies having due regard to the requirements of efficiency.

(12) The Constitution should embody adequate safeguards

for the protection of Moslem culture and for the protection and promotion of Moslem education, language, religion, personal laws and Moslem charitable institutions and for their due share in the grants-in-aid given by the State and by local self-governing bodies.

(13) No cabinet, either Central or Provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one-third Moslem Ministers.

(14) No change shall be made in the constitution by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of the states constituting the Indian Federation.

The draft resolution also mentioned an alternative to the above provision in the following terms:

That, in the present circumstances, representation of Mussalmans in the different legislatures of the country and other elected bodies through the separate electorates is inevitable and further, the Government being pledged over and over again not to disturb this franchise so granted to the Moslem community since 1909 till such time as the Mussalmans choose to abandon it, the Mussalmans will not consent to joint electorates, unless Sind is acutally constituted into a separate province and reforms in fact are introduced in the N.-W.F. Province and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other provinces.

Further, it is provided that there shall be reservation of seats according to the Moslem population in the various provinces; but where Mussalmans are in a majority they shall not contest more seats than their population warrants.

The question of excess representation of Mussalmans over and above, their population in provinces where they are in a minority, is to be considered hereafter.

(After the Muslim League Delegation's failure to secure some amendments in the Nehru Committee's draft constitutional scheme at the All-Parties Convention at Calcutta, December 1928, the Muslim League session was adjourned to meet again at Delhi. This draft resolution, prepared by Mr Jinnah, was to be moved at the session reconvened at Delhi in March 1929, but the session had to be adjourned *sine die* owing to disturbances created by a group of "Nationalist" Muslims.)

38

Mr M. A. Jinnah's letter to British Prime Minister, Mr Ramsay McDonald, 19 June, 1929

Dear Mr MacDonald,

I think you will remember our conversation in July last while I was in London. In view of what you said to me then and the great kindness with which you treated me, I am encouraged to feel that I must place before you the situation as it presents itself to me. In the solution and settlement of this question vital interests of Great Britain and India are involved which I think you appreciate and understand more than anybody else as you possess personal knowledge of India during the time you were on the Islington Commission. But much water has run down the Thames and the Ganges since then. The present position is a very serious deadlock and if allowed to continue, it will, in my judgment, prove disastrous both to the interests of India and Great Britain.

The Simon Commission was boycotted by political India, of which there can be very little doubt. The exclusion of Indians from the personnel of the Commission from start to finish relegated the Indians to the position of suppliants and assessors, and let me tell you, whatever you may hear to the contrary, you will never get political India to cooperate with the scheme further if the various stages of the scheme are adhered to strictly. But the task of the Simon Commission, as it was repeatedly declared by responsible men and the press in England, was that of a "rapporteur".

So far as India is concerned, we have done with it and when its report, whatever it may be, is published in due course, every effort will be made in India to damn it. Of course, this is on the assumption that it will not be satisfactory, which is already assumed in India. After the publication of the report, if the programme and the plan of the scheme of the Commission as announced are adhered to, as I understand it will be, His Majesty's Government will wait until they get the considered opinion of the Government of India on that report and after that they will formulate their definite proposals and place them before Parliament to be referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee without the House definitely committing itself with regard to those proposals of His Majesty's Government; and

that at this stage the Indian representatives will be given the opportunity to place their views before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. What chance of success is there in their efforts to get at that stage any modifications of a substantial character at the hands of the Joint Parliamentary Committee?

It strikes me, and I think you will agree, that in the normal course there will be no chance of getting the Joint Parliamentary Committee to make any radical change, and my reasons are as follows:

"The Joint Parliamentary Committee will be in this position. They will have, in the first instance, before them the recommendations of the Simon Commission; secondly, the views and the proposals of the Government of India, which I assume will be reactionary—and that is the opinion and feeling in India—and with those materials before them the definite proposals which will be formulated by His Majesty's Government will be referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. I should have thought that at that stage so far as the principles underlying the proposals are concerned, we shall stand not only precluded but barred from suggesting any modification of the fundamental principles of the proposals as referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee by the House, and all that can at that stage be done reasonably and with any success would be to discuss and, if possible, to modify the details of these proposals. If that is all the advantage that is still open to the Indian representatives, can you conceive that political India having boycotted the Simon Commission and the scheme at the stage of enquiry and investigations could now be induced to cooperate directly or indirectly with the further stages of the scheme when, as I have pointed out, no real useful purpose would be served?"

India has lost her faith in the word of Great Britain. The first and foremost thing that I would ask you to consider, is how best to restore that faith and revive the confidence of India in the *bona fides* of Great Britain. His Excellency the Viceroy, Lord Irwin addressing the Legislature on January 28, 1929, attempted to perform this task. This is what he says:

"But I tell this Assembly again, and through them India, that the Declaration of 1917 stands and will stand for all time as the solemn pledge of the British people to do all that can be done by one people to assist another to attain full national political stature, and the pledge so given will never be dishonoured. And as actions are commonly held more powerful than words. I will add that I should not be standing before you here

today as Governor-General if I believed that the British people had withdrawn their hand from that solemn covenant. Those, therefore, who preach that a new generation has arisen in England which seeks to explain away the significance of the 1917 declaration are, consciously or unconsciously but none the less really, misrepresenting the purpose of Great Britain and poisoning the wells by which the common life of India and Great Britain is supported and sustained."

You will notice from this quotation that I am not singular in my opinion that India is fast losing faith in Great Britain. The reason again for this is not far to seek. In 1924, in the course of an important debate in the Legislative Assembly on a resolution urging the Government to take steps to review the Government of India Act with a view to establishing full responsible Government in India, Sir Malcolm Hailey, in the course of his speech on behalf of the Government of India, in effect, repudiated that the Declaration of 1917 and the preamble to the Government of India Act, means that Great Britain was committed to the policy of granting full self-governing Dominion Status to India. He said: "The pronouncement of August 1917, spoke of the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India. That is also the term used in the preamble to the Act, that is the term used in the Royal Warrant of Instructions which adds that thus will India be fitted to take her place among the other Dominions. The term has its significance. We know that it was deliberately chosen. The Congress and the League had asked the Imperial Government to proclaim its intention to confer self-Government on India at an early date and the Cabinet chose the present term. The expression used in the Act, is a term of precision, conveying that the Executive in India would be responsible to the Indian Legislature instead of to the British Parliament. If you analyse the term "full dominion self-government" you will see that it is of somewhat wider extent conveying that not only will the Executive be responsible to the Legislature but the Legislature will in itself have the full powers which are typical of the modern Dominion. It may be, there is some difference of substance because responsible Government is not necessarily incompatible with a legislature with limited or restricted powers. It may be that full Dominion Self-Government is the logical outcome of responsible Government, nay, it may be the inevitable and historical development of responsible Government, but it is a further and a final step."

Further, you know in the recent publication of the memoirs

of Lord Curzon, I think, it was discovered that there was some difference of opinion as to the significance of the words which were finally adopted in the declaration of August 1917 between Lord Curzon and Mr Montagu. Along with this the policy of the Government of India and His Majesty's Government since 1924 in turning a deaf ear to all reasonable demands has led almost every political party to come to the conclusion that there is no hope of getting any fairplay and thus there is a section in India that has already declared in favour of complete independence and I may tell you without exaggeration that the movement for independence is gaining ground, as it is supported by the Indian National Congress.

This being a short summary of the position, I would most earnestly urge upon you at this moment to persuade His Majesty's Government without delay to make a declaration that Great Britain is unequivocally pledged to the policy of granting to India full responsible Government with Dominion status. The effect of such a declaration will be very far reaching and go a great way to create a different atmosphere in the country and will be a very severe antidote to the movement for independence. But, here again I must admit, in the words of the Viceroy, that we must not forget that actions are held more powerful than words. Naturally, therefore, the next question that presents itslelf to all thinking men is what action or actions should be taken, and may I quote again from the same speech of Lord Irwin. That is what he says:

"It would seem evident, however, that what all people must desire is a solution reached by mutual agreement between Great Britain and India, and that, in the present circumstances, the friendly collaboration of Great Britain and India, is a requisite and indispensable condition to obtain it. On the one side it is as unprofitable to deny the right to Parliament to form its free and deliberate judgment on the problems as it would be short-sighted of Parliament to underrate the importance of trying to reach a solution which might carry the willing assent of political India."

May I suggest a solution, which I think would most probably be acceptable to India. His Majesty's Government before they formulate their proposals and after they are in receipt of the Simon Commission Report and the views of the Government of India, and so, before they formulate their proposals, should invite representatives of India, who would be in a position to deliver the goods (because completely unanimous opinion in India is not possible at present), to sit in conference with them

with a veiw to reaching a solution which might carry, to use the words of the Viceroy, the "willing assent of the political India." If such an invitation comes directly from the Prime Minister on behalf of His Majesty's Government, I feel that it will be irresistible and if such a conference is held with men, who are in the front and the foremost rank of political India, I am not unhopeful that a solution may be reached satisfactory to Great Britain and India.

Will you, therefore, consider these proposals of mine with the care and attention that you can give them. In short, it comes to this: (1) declaration of policy, (2) followed up with an invitation from His Majesty's Government with a view to arriving at an agreement as to the future constitution of India before His Majesty's Government formulated any definite proposals and place them before Parliament. His Majesty's Government will be, as I have said before, armed already with the Simon Report and the Government of India despatch on it, both of them, I assume, will not be satisfactory.

As to the personnel of the representatives of India to be invited, you may well ask me by what methods are we to get them. I have very carefully considered the pros and cons and I have come to the conclusion that if we are to elect our represenatives in the Assembly and confine ourselves to the members of the Assembly, there are men outside the Assembly whose presence would be indispensable for a conference of the kind I am contemplating. On the other hand, if it is thrown open to non-members, it might lead to a great deal of canvassing and rivalry and we may not get the personnel, we may desire. I think you yourself are fairly will-acquainted with the names of prominent political leaders in India. But besides that His Excellency the Viceroy, I think, by now knows pretty well who is who in the political world of India and further the members of the Government of India would be able to guide you, if necessary. But you must take upon yourself to invite such men as you may be advised, to go over to London and confer with His Majesty's Government and sit in conference with the Cabinet. On course, the number should be, as far as possible, not very large. I should restrict the number to about fifteen.

This shortly is the scheme which I would put before you, and I have no doubt that you will give your most earnest consideration to it.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

39

Lord Irwin's Statement on Dominion Status, 31 October, 1920

I have just returned from England where I have had the opportunity of prolonged consultation with His Majesty's Government. Before I left this country I said publicly that as the King-Emperor's representative in India, I should hold myself bound to tell me fellow countrymen, as faithfully as I might, of India's feelings, anxieties and aspirations. In my endeavours to discharge that undertaking, I was excited by finding, as I had expected, a generous and sincere desire, not only on the part of His Majesty's Government but on that of all persons and parties in Great Britain, to hear and to appreciate everything that it was my duty to represent.

The goal of British policy was stated in the declaration of August 1917 to be that of providing for the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. As I recently pointed out, my own Instrument of Instruction from the King-Emperor expressly states that it is His Majesty's will and pleasure that the plans laid by Parliament in 1919, should be the means by which British India may attain its due place among His Dominions. Ministers of the Crown, moreover, have more than once publicly declared that it is the desire of the British Government that India should, in the fullness of time, take her place in the Empire in equal partnership with the Dominions. But in view of the doubts which have been expressed both in Great Britain and India regarding the interpretation to be placed on the intentions of the British Government in enacting the Statute of 1919, I am authorised on behalf of His Majesty's Government to state clearly that in their judgment it is implicit in the declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as there contemplated, is the attainment of Dominion status.

In the full realisation of this policy, it is evidently important that the Indian States should be afforded an opportunity of finding their place, and even if we cannot at present exactly foresee on what lines this development may be shaped, it is from every point of view desirable that whatever can be done should be done to ensure that action taken now is not incon-

sistent with the attainment of the ultimate purpose which those, whether in British India or the States, who look forward to some unity of All-India, have in view.

His Majesty's Government consider that both these objects, namely, that of finding the best approach to the British Indian side of the problem, and secondly, of ensuring that in this process of the wider question of closer relations in the future between the two parts of Greater India is not overlooked, can best be achieved by the adoption of procedure such as the Commission has outlined. When, therefore, the Commission and the Indian Central Committee have submitted their Reports and these have been published, and when His Majesty's Government have been able, in consultation with the Government of India to consider these matters in the light of all the material then available, they will propose to invite representatives of different parties and interests in British India and representatives of the Indian States to meet them, separately or together as circumstances may demand, for purpose of conference and discussion in regard both to the British India and the All-Indian problems. It will be their earnest hope that by this means it may subsequently prove possible on these grave issues to submit proposals to Parliament which may command a wide measure of general assent.

40

Nehru Committee's Report and the Hindu-Muslim question

On the general question of representation of communities the Report said: "From the constitutional point of view the communal controversies are of no very great importance. But whatever their relative importance might be, they occupy men's minds much more than matters of greater import and cast their shadow over all political work. We, therefore, find ourselves face to face with a number of conflicting resolutions and recommendations all of which are equally entitled to our respect. But when we find that the view of the Madras Congress (1927) and the Muslim League is diametrically opposed to that of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Sikh League, we must respectfully express our inability to accept either in its entirety." (It is clear that the decisions of the Nehru Committee were influenced by the views of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Sikh League).

With regard to the questions of separate electorate and

separation of Sind the Report observed: "The Muslims being in a minority in India as a whole fear that the majority may harass them and to meet this difficulty they have made a novel suggestion that they should at least dominate in some parts of India. We do not here criticise their demand. It may have some justification in the present communal atmosphere, but we do feel it has little to do with the premises we started from, unless indeed the best safeguard that one can have is to occupy a position of dominance oneself. The Hindus, on the other hand, although in a great majority all over India, are in a minority in Bengal and the Punjab and in Sind, Baluchistan and N.-W.F. Province. Inspite of their all-India majority, thay are afraid of the Muslims in these provinces."

The Committee took a sympathetic view of Hindu apprehensions in the event of separation of Sind from Bombay and tried to soothe the Hindu feelings by remarking: "We suspect that the real opposition to separation is not due to any high national considerations but to grosser economic considerations; to the fear of the Hindus that their economic position might suffer if Muslims had the charge of affairs in a separated area. We are sure that Hindus of Sind are perhaps the most enterprising and adventurous. The traveller meets them in the four quarters of the world, carrying on prosperous business and enriching their people at home by their earnings abroad. No one can take away this spirit of adventure and enterprise from the Hindus of Sind and so long as they have it their future is assured. It must be remembered also that the powers of a Provincial Government are limited and there is the Central Government which has power in all important matters. If, however, there is still some ground for fear that is a matter for safeguards, not of opposing a just demand."

The Committee dismissed the Muslim demand for one-third representation in the Central Legislature in these words: "So far as the Muslim demand is concerned, it only remains for us to deal with that part of it which relates to reservation of one-third of the total number of seats in the Central Legislature for Muslims. This point was not directly raised or discussed at the informal conference, but we think that it is concluded by the general recommendations we have made in regard to reservation of seats. The principle we have adopted is that wherever such reservation has to be made for the Muslim minority, it must be in strict proportion to its population. The Muslims are a little less than one-fourth of the total population of British India and

they cannot be allowed reservation over and above that proportion in the Central Legislature."

With regard to the form of electorate and reservation of seats for minorities the Committee decided in favour of joint electorate, rejected the proposal for reservation of seats on population basis in Bengal and the Punjab and conceded reservation of seats for Muslims in the Hindu majority provinces strictly in proportion to population without any weightage. Even recognition of the demand for separation of Sind from Bombay was hedged in by many conditions as follows:

(1) Simulataneously with the establishment of Government in accordance with the Nehru Committee's Report, Sind shall be separated from bombay and constituted into a separate province, provided after inquiry it is found that

(*a*) Sind is financially self-supporting;

(*b*) in the event of its being found that it is not financially self-supporting, on the scheme of separation being laid before the people of Sind with its financial and administrative aspects, the majority of the inhabitants favour the scheme and express their readiness to bear the financial responsibility of the new arrangements.

(2) That the form of government in Sind shall be the same as in the other Provinces under the Constitution.

(3) That the non-Muslim minority in Sind shall be given the same privileges in the matter of representation in the Provincial and Central Legislatures as the Muslim minorities are given under the Nehru Committee's Report in areas where they are in a minority.

The Muslims' proposal for residuary powers in the Provinces and a federal form of government was rejected and the Hindu demand for a strong Central Government with Provinces as subordinate branches enjoying only limited powers was endorsed by the Nehru Report. The Committee opted for Dominion Status in preference to complete independence.

41

Mr M. A, Jinnah's speech at the plenary session of the First Round Table Conference, 28 November, 1930

Mr President, to use your own words, I can assure you

that we are here to cooperate, animated by a determination to succeed.

The first point that I should like to deal with is the point with regard to the moral claims of Great Britain on the one side and the sins of commission and omission by Great Britain on the other. I tell you, Sir, this, that I am one of those who believe that no useful purpose will be served by going into that question. Let that question, may I say to those who indulge in it on both sides, be decided by the historians. For my purpose it is enough that Great Britain is in india. I have no hesitation in conceding this proposition—that you have a great interest in India, both commercial and political, and therefore, you are a party, if I may say so, gravely interested in the future constitution of India. But when I have said that, I want you equally to concede frankly—and frankness does not mean wounding anybody's feelings, nor that we are influenced by bitterness; it means, as I understand, particularly in a Conference like this, that we should put our points of view frankly and respectfully and without wounding anybody's feellings, and therefore, I shall avoid any kind of bitterness. When I have said this, I want you equally to concede that we have a greater and far more vital interest than you have, because you have the financial or commercial interest and the political interest, but to us it is all in all.

Now, in that spirit, you are sitting on that side of the Conference and we are sitting on this side, let us approach every question. I almost said that really there are four parties, not forgetting the other smaller minorities, such as the Sikhs and the Christians, and not forgetting for a single moment the depressed classes. But there are four main parties sitting round the table now. There are the British Party, the Indian Princes, the Hindus and the Muslims.

Let us, Sir, consider what is the issue with which we are engaged. Before I come to that issue, I want to despel one thing. There is a certain amount of misunderstanding, or want of understanding. I want you to understand particularly on account of the observations of Lord Peel. Lord Peel said that his Party was gravely disturbed by the non-cooperation movement. Having emphasised that, he concluded by saying that if we came to any agreement and gave you a great advance in the constitution of India, it would be taken advantage of by those who would like to wreck it. Now, Sir, let us understand the position of India. The position in India is that there is no section, whether they are Hindus or Mohammadans or whether

they are Sikhs or Christians or Parsis or depressed classes, or even commercial classes, merchants, or traders, there is not one section in India that has not emphatically declared that India must have a full that has not emphatically declared that India must have a full measure of self-government. When you say that a large, a very influential, party in India stands for wrecking or misusing the future constitution, I ask you this question: Do you want those parties who have checked, held in abeyance the party that stands for complete independence, do you want those people to go back with this answer from you—that nothing can be done because there is a strong party which will misuse or wreck the constitution which we will get from you? Is that the answer you want to give? Now let me tell you the tremendous fallacy of that argument and the grave danger. Seventy millions of Mussalmans—all barring a few individuals here and there—have kept aloof from the non-cooperation movement. Thirty-five or forty millions of depressed classes have set their face against the non-cooperation movement. Sikhs and Christians have not joined it. And let me tell you that even amongst that party which you characterise as a large party—and I admit that it is an important party—it has not got the support of the bulk of Hindus. Do you want every one of the parties who have still maintained that their proper place is to go to this Conference, and across the Table to negotiate and come to settlement which will satisfy the aspirations of India, to go back and join the rest? Is that what you want? Because what other position will they occupy? What will be the answer? I want you to consider the gravity of it, a gravity which was emphasised by the previous speakers. You may, of course, argue it as long as you like.

Now let us understand the character and the function of this Conference. Speaking on behalf of the British India Delegation, I do not want to indulge in generalities, but I want to put before you the cardinal principle by which we shall be guided in the further proceedings of this Conference. I must admit that, while I am stating this cardinal principle, we must have regard to facts and to realities—and that is why we are here, to hammer out those facts and those realities and to hammer out a constitution for India which will satisfy the people of India. That cardinal principle which shall be the guide as far as we are concerned is this, that—if I call it Dominion Status I know that Lord Reading will put a poser as to what is the meaning of Dominion Status; I know if I use the words "responsible Government" somebody else will put me a poser, "What do you mean by responsible Government?" I know if I use the expression

"full self-government" somebody else will ask me a similar question; but I say the cardinal principle which will guide us throughout the deliberations of this Conference is that India wants to be mistress in her own house; and I cannot conceive of any constitution that you may frame which will not transfer responsibility in the Central Government to a Cabinet responsible to the Legislature. If that is the cardinal principle by which we shall be guided, then, as Lord Reading very rightly pointed out, there may be questions, such as defence and foreign policy and so on, which will require adjustments. I do not think there is any secret on that point so far as the British India Delegation is concerned. Whoever has used the phrase Dominion Status so far as this Table is concerned has always said, "with safeguards during the transitional period." Sir, that is going to be our cardinal principle.

To sum up the substance of the speeches of Lord Peel and Lord Reading, the only point that emerged was the difference with regard to the pace. I will only say one thing before I proceed a little further, and it is this, that self-government is not an abstract thing; it is a business proposition, and if the power of the Government is transferred to a Cabinet responsible to the Legislature, the first and foremost thing that we have to provide is that the various interests are safeguarded, and you cannot possibly frame any constitution, unless you have provided safeguards for the rights and interests which exist in India. First, there is the minority question, which we shall have to tackle, and unless you create that sense of security among the minorities, which will secure a willing cooperation and allegiance to the State, no constitution that you may frame will work successfully. Very rightly the Indian Princes are here, and you cannot very well frame a constitution for India, for self-government in the sense in which I have described it without taking into consideration their position; and all that the Princes are anxious about is that they want certain safeguards in that constitution, as the Mussalmans demand safeguards for their community.

The next point, Sir, that I want to make is this. It was said by Lord Peel that there was the journey and the journey's end, as he read from the speech of Lord Irwin. May I point out to him that, in that very speech, this is what Lord Irwin said, which Lord Peel omitted:

"Although it is true that in our external relations with other parts of the Empire India exhibits already several of the

attributes of self-governing Dominions, it is also true that Indian political opinion is not at present disposed to attach full value to these attributes of status, for the reason that their practical exercise is for the most part subject to the control or concurrence of His Majesty's Government. The demand for Dominion Status that is now made on behalf of India is based upon the general claim to be free from control, more especially in those spheres that are regarded as of predominantly domestic interest; and here, as is generally recognised, there are real difficulties, internal to India and peculiar to her circumstances and to world conditions, that have to be faced, and in regard to which there may be sharp variation of opinion both in India and in Great Britain. The existence of these difficulties cannot be seriously disputed, and the whole object of the Conference now proposed is to afford the opportunity to His Majesty's Government of examining, in free consultation with Indian leaders, how they may best, most rapidly and most surely be surmounted."

One more word I will say with regard to the pace. You, Sir, speaking two years ago at a meeting, said this, presiding at the British Labour Conference in London in 1928:

"I hope that within a period of months, rather than years, there will be a new Dominion added to the Commonwealth of our nations, a Dominion of another race, a Dominion that will find self-respect as an equal within the Commonwealth—I refer to India."

And yet, Sir, the crux of the two speeches of Lord Peel and of Lord Reading is that our differences are still with regard to the pace. Since 1928 two years have passed.

There is one more thing that I want to say. It is this. I think we have lost sight of the announcement and declaration of October 31, 1929, which has created us. From that announcement I will read one passage:

"The Chairman of the Commission has pointed out, in correspondence with the Prime Minister which, I understand, is being published in England, that, as their investigation has proceeded, he and his colleagues have been greatly impressed, in considering the directions which the future constitutional development in India is likely to take, with the importance of bearing in mind the relations which may at some future time develop between British India and the Indian States. In their judgment, it is essential that the methods by which this future relationship between these two constituent parts of Greater

India can be adjusted should be fully examined. He has further expressed the opinion that if the Commission's Report and the proposals subsequently to be framed by the Government take this wider range, it will appear necessary for the Government to revise the scheme or procedure as at present proposed."

Therefore, Sir, when Lord Peel says that some of the recommendations of the Simon Commission are revolutionary the Chairman of that Commission himself suggests that, in the light of the inclusion of the Indian Princes, you have not only radically changed the procedure, but the whole aspect of the position is changed altogether. Sir, let me tell you this in conclusion, that, so far as we are concerned, the Simon Commission's Report is dead. The Government of India Despatch is already a back number, and there has arisen a new star in our midst today, and that is the Indian Princes. Their position has even placed the demand of British India for Dominion Status for the moment in the background, and we are now thinking of a Dominion of All-India. Therefore, it is no use your believing still in the Report of the Simon Commission or in the Despatch of the Government of India. I must say, in conclusion, that I am very much moved by, and that I welcome warmly, the noble attitude, the patriotic attitude, that the Indian Princes have shown.

There is only one word I would like to say, because there might be some misapprehension. It was said by His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala and also by His Highness the Jam Sahib that, "before we consider the question of all-India federation we must have our status determined and decided by a judicial tribunal." I could not quite appreciate the force of that statement, but may I say to my friends, the State Delegates, that whatever may be their position with regard to the orders that the Government of India may have passed under the present constitution, that constitution is now in the melting pot, and they do not want anyone else to decide their status and rights. They are here to assert their status and rights. Whatever decisions this Conference may come to, and if there is an agreement, and if Parliament gives effect to it, it does not matter what has been laid down in the Butler Report or what has been laid down in the Secretariat of Simla or Delhi.

One more word about Parliament. It was said and emphasised by Lord Peel and by Lord Reading that Parliament must decide this question. We know that. We would not have been here if we did not expect Parliament finally to decide it. But

remember, the original idea was that His Majesty's Government, in conference with the leaders of British India and of the Indian States, were to obtain the largest measure of agreement; and that if any such agreement was arrived at, they would put these proposals before Parliament. I am very glad, although I was opposed to the idea of the British Delegations being included—I tell you that frankly—because, as a businessman, I thought it was better to negotiate with one than to negotiate with three. It is more difficult to get three to agree. Therefore, I was opposed to it. Now you are here. Don't you represent Parliament—the three Parties? You do, and if you come to an agreement, are you afraid that Parliament will repudiate it? May I read here what Lord Irwin said about it when this question was raised:

"It would seem evident, however, that what all people most desire is a solution reached by mutual agreement between Great Britain and India, and that in the present circumstances friendly collaboration between Great Britain and India is a requisite and indispensable condition in order to obtain it. On the one side it is unprofitable to deny the right of Parliament to form its free and deliberate judgment on the problem, as it would be short-sighted of Parliament to underrate the importance of trying to reach a solution which might carry the willing assent of political India."

In this case now, as the Conference is constituted, it is not only possible to get the willing assent of India, but of the British Delegations who represent the three parties in Parliament. It would be a very bold Parliament indeed that would dare repudiate any agreement that might be arrived at with the widest measure of support at this Table.

42

Extracts from Maulana Mohammad Ali's speech at the plenary session of the Round Table Conference, 1930

In reply to Lord Peel, I will only quote to him from an English poet as I did when we were going through the lobby. I said, "I hope your Lordship is a Conservative and will remain a Conservative; because the only definition that I read of a Conservative was in Tennyson, who said,

'He is the best Conservative
Who lops the mouldered branch away'."

I think those ideas which Lord Peel expressed, very sincerely and frankly, really represent the mouldered branch which should be lopped away. This is my only answer to him. As regards the other Conservative, our own Prince from India, namely, His Highness the Maharaja Sahib of Rewa, I am not quite sure about his conservatism. If he takes Burke to be a Conservative, and quotes him at the end of his speech, I would say: "Be a Conservative and stick to it," for, quoting Burke, His Highness said, "Small minds and large empires go ill together." If the British Empire—call it Empire, call it Commonwealth of Nations, whatever you choose to call it, I do not care—if the British Empire desires to remain big, the small minds that have been visible and audible only too long must disappear. If you had followed Burke, you would not have lost America, and you would not be talking of parity today in building warships. There should be much more talk of charity. And you would not have all those debts to pay. You would not have all that worry. You would not have to go so often to Geneva to the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference. How long that preparation is going to take Heaven only knows. All these things came in because you forgot your greatest politician, your greatest statesman, who was the man who, in the House of Commons, was called the "dinner bell," because when Burke got up to speak, you all left and went to the dining room. You still do that to people who are like Burke, and I therefore, say—and I quote him once again—"Men, not measures." I do not care what constitution you prepare for us; but all would be well if you have got one man in England who is a real man—

"Oh God! for a man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and every by.
One still strong man in a blatant land,
Whatever they call him, what care I?—
Aristocrat, autocrat, democrat—one
Who can rule and dare not lie."

I hope my old friend, Mr MacDonald, will at least prove the man to rule, and that he would not dare to lie to his own Party, to his own conscience, to his dead wife, and to his living country; and if you, people of all parties assist him, as you should, I assure you we will make history. But even more than I trust my old friend, Mr Ramsay MacDonald, I, a republican, make this confession, that I place my trust in the man—I call him a man, because "a man's man for a that"—who inaugurated this Conference in the Gallery of the House of Loıds, whose name is

George. Whether you call him His Majesty or whatever you call him, he is a man! He knows India better than any of his Ministers, past or present, and I am looking up to him to do justice to the 320 millions who constitute one-fifth of the whole of humanity, and I am strengthened in that belief by the wonderful patriotism shown by the Princes arrayed over there, the conservative element in India. It must be a revelation to my Lord Peel and to my Lord Reading; it is no revelation to me. . . . .

The fact is that today the one purpose for which I came is this—that I want to go back to my country if I can go back with the substance of freedom in my hand. Otherwise, I will not go back to a slave country. I would even prefer to die in a foreign country so long as it is a free country, and *if you do not give us freedom in India you will have to give me a grave here.*

. . . . . If any man has saved the British Empire today, it is that tall, thin Christian! If Lord Irwin was not there today, heaven only knows what would have happened. At least I would not be the "convert" I am supposed to be. We should not have been at this Round Table. It is for the sake of peace, friendship and freedom that we have come here, and I hope we shall go back with all that. If we do not, we go back into the ranks of fighters where we were ten years before. They may now call us traitors to the country. You may then call us rebels or outlaws. We do not care.

I have said something about His Excellency Lord Irwin, but I do not wish to associate all that with his Government. They have woefully mismanaged things. The only good point about their Despatch is that it has provided us with another "historic document". The Simon Commission's Report is not the only document we have to consider. The Despatch is a most disappointing document. The best thing we can do after it, is to create our own "historic document" here. . . . .

I have not come to ask for Dominion Status. I do not believe in the attainment of Dominion Status. The one thing to which I am committed is complete independence. In Madras in 1927, we passed a resolution making that our goal. In 1928, in the Convention of All Parties, the adoption of the Nehru Report Constitution was moved, the very first clause of which was about Dominion Status. Even my old Secretary, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Congress today, was kept down by his father. There is a Persian proverb which says: "Be a dog, do not be a younger brother." And when you see my big brother over there, "seven feet by five," as Colonel Wedgwood

called him, you can well believe, I believe, in this Persian proverb. In the case of Jawaharlal I would say, "Be a cat, do not be the son of your father." For it was his father who, as President of the Congress, throttled poor Jawaharlal at Calcutta in 1928. Well I got up in his place, when he could not speak for complete independence, and I opposed the clause dealing with Dominion Status. But in 1930, I would not go further like Jawaharlal and make it my creed, because once we make it our creed in the Congress, we cannot admit anybody into the Congress who does not hold that creed. I like to keep the door open for negotiation. I would not like to slam the door in the face of anybody. His Excellency Lord Irwin, a Conservative Viceroy, was "the man on the spot." And he was sufficiently impressed by what he saw on the spot and came here. When we come to London, we hear that everybody is appealing to "the man in the street." Whether "the man in the street" is ever heard or not, I do not know; but Lord Rothermere and Lord Beaverbrook and everybody else always talk about "the man in the street" as the final court of appeal. In India, it is always "the man on the spot." Well, "the man on the spot" came here and he talked to the leading "man in the street," who is presiding here. I am sure, he preached to the converted. They brought round Mr Baldwin also; they brought round some Conservatives; they brought round everybody they could and made the announcement that Dominion Status was meant, when in 1917, they said "Responsible Government." That cleared the fog which had been created in a very memorable meeting of the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1924 by the Officer incharge of the Home Department at the time, who I am glad is present here today.

As I said two or three days ago, India has put on fifty-league boots. We are making forced marches which will astonish the world and we will not go back to India unless a new Dominion is born. If we go back to India without the birth of a new Dominion we shall go back, believe me, to a lost Dominion. We shall go back to an America. Then you will witness, not within the British Commonwealth or the British Empire, but outside it, with the Indian Princes, with Dr Moonje, with Mr Jayakar, with myself and my brother, a Free and United States of India. It will be some thing more than that. As I wrote shortly after leaving Oxford long years ago, in India, we shall have something better than an America, because we shall not only have a United States, but we shall have United Faiths

"Not like to like, but like in difference;
Self-reverent each and reverencing each;

Distinct in individualities;
But like each other, e'en as those who love."

It is with these passions surging in our hearts that we have come here. It now depends upon our Conservative friends, upon our Radical friends, upon our Labour friends, and still more upon the one man whom I trust more in England than anybody else—His Majesty King George, the grandson of Victoria the Good, whose love for India nobody dare deny. Her whole life was the Magna Charta of India, and in her grandson's time history will be written again like this: "George III lost America. George V won India!"

One word as to the Muslim position, with which I shall deal at length on some other occasion. Many people in England ask us why this question of Hindu and Muslim comes into politics, and what it has to do with these things. I reply, "It is a wrong conception of religion that you have, if you exclude politics from it. It is not dogma; it is nct ritual! Religion, to my mind, means the interpretation of life." I have a culture, a polity, an outlook on life—a complete synthesis which is Islam. Where God commands I am a Muslim first, a Muslim second, and a Muslim last, and nothing but a Muslim. If you ask me to enter into your Empire or into your Nation by leaving that synthesis, that polity, that culture, that ethics, I will not do it. My first duty is to my Maker, not to H.M. the King, nor to my companion Dr Moonje; my first duty is to my Maker, and that is the case with Dr Moonje also. He must be a Hindu first, and I must be a Muslim first, so far as that duty is concerned. But where India is concerned, where India's freedom is concerned, where the welfare of India is concerned, I am an Indian first, an Indian second, an Indian last, and nothing but an Indian.

I belong to two circles of equal size, but which are not concentric. One is India, and the other is the Muslim world. When I came to England in 1920 at the head of the Khilafat Delegation, my friends said: "You must have some sort of a crest for your stationery." I decided to have it with two circles on it. In one circle was the word "India" in the other circle was Islam, with the word "Khilafat". We as Indian Muslims came in both circles. We belong to these two circles, each of more than 300 millions, and we can leave neither. We are not nationalists but supernationalists, and I as a Muslim say that "God made man and the Devil made the nation." Nationalism divides; our religion binds. No religious wars, no crusades, have seen such holocausts and have been so cruel as your last war, and that was

a war of your nationalism, and not my Jehad.

But where our country is concerned, where the question of taxation is concerned, where our crops are concerned, where the weather is concerned, where all associations in those thousands of matters of ordinary life are concerned, which are for the welfare of India, how can I say "I am a Muslim and he is a Hindu?" Make no mistake about the quarrels between Hindu and Muslim; they are founded only on the fear of domination. If there is one other sin with which I charge Great Britain, in addition to the sin of emasculating India, it is the sin of making wrong histories about India and teaching them to us in our schools, with the result that our school boys have learnt wrong Indian history. The quarrels which are sometimes visible in our streets on certain holidays or quarrels the motives of which have been instilled into the hearts of our socalled intelligentsia—I call it unintelligentsia—by the wrong history taught us in our schools for political purposes. If that feeling, which writes "Revenche" so large over the politics of certain people in India, existed as it does, and if it existed to the extent which it does today, and the Muslims were everywhere in a minority of 25 per cent, and the Hindus were everywhere in a majority of 66 per cent, I could see no ray of hope today; but thanks to the jerrymandering of our saints and our soldiers, if there are Provinces like that of my friend, Dr Moonje, in which I am only 4 per cent, there are other Provinces where I am 93 per cent, as in the Province of my friend Nawab Sir Abdul Qaiyum, for which we demand equal freedom. There is the old Province of Sind, where the Muslims first landed, where they are 73 per cent, in the Punjab they are 56 per cent, and jn Bengal 55 per cent. That gives us our safeguard, for we demand hostages as we have willingly given hostages to Hindus in the other Provinces where they form huge majorities.

. . . . For the first time in India, we are going to introduce majority rule, and I, belonging to a minority community, accept that majority rule, although I know very well that if 51 people say that 2 and 2 make 5, and 49 people say that 2 and 2 make 4, the fact that 51 say that 2 and 2 make 5 does not cause them make 5. Still I am prepared to submit to majority rule. Luckily, however, there are Muslim majorities in certain Provinces, and with the federal form of government which is suited to India, not only for the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem, but is essential for the sake of the Princes also, this is in our favour. The centrifugal and centripetal tendencies are so well balanced in India that we are bound to have a federal system of govern-

ment there, not as a distant ideal, as the Government of India says, but today, now, this minute. We shall leave this conference only with federation established in India, with new treaties made with the Princes, with the consent of the Crown and the Princes.

43

Extracts from Allama Iqbal's presidential address at the twenty-first session of the All-India League, Allahabad, 29 December, 1930

It cannot be denied that Islam, regarded as an ethical ideal plus a certain kind of polity—by which expression I mean a social structure, regulated by a legal system and animated by a specific ethical ideal—has been the chief formative factor in the life-history of the Muslims of India. It has furnished those basic emotions and loyalties which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups, and finally transform them into a well-defined people, possessing a moral consciousness of their own. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that India is perhaps the only country in the world where Islam, as a people-building force, has worked at its best. In India, as elsewhere, the structure of Islam as a society is almost entirely due to the working of Islam as a culture inspired by a specific ethical ideal. What I mean to say is that Muslim society, with its remarkable homogeneity and inner unity, has grown to be what it is, under the pressure of the laws and institutions associated with the culture of Islam. The ideas set free by European political thinking, however, are now rapidly changing the outlook of the present generation of Muslims both in India and outside India. Our younger men, inspired by these ideas, are anxious to see them as living forces in their own countries, without any critical appreciation of the facts which have determined their evolution in Europe. In Europe Christianity was understood to be a purely monastic order which gradually developed into a vast church-organization. The protest of Luther was directed against this church-organization, not against any system of polity of a secular nature, for the obvious reason that there was no such polity associated with Christianity. And Luther was perfectly justified in rising in revolt against this organisation; though I think, he did not realize that in the peculiar conditions which obtained in Europe his revolt would eventually mean the complete displacement of universal ethics of Jesus by the growth of a plurality of national and hence

narrower systems of ethics. Thus the upshot of the intellectual movement initiated by such men as Rousseau and Luther was the break-up of the one into a mutually ill-adjusted many, the transformation of a human into a national outlook, requiring a more realistic foundation, such as the notion of country, and finding expression through varying systems of polity evolved on national lines, i.e. on lines which recognize territory as the only principle of political solidarity. If you begin with the conception of religion as complete other worldiness, than what has happened to Christianity in Europe is perfectly natural. The universal ethics of Jesus is displaced by national systems of ethics and polity. The conclusion to which Europe is consequently driven is that religion is a private affair of the individual and has nothing to do with what is called "man's temporal life". Islam does not bifurcate the unity of man into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter. In Islam God and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state, are organic to each other. Man is not the citizen of a profane world to be renounced in the interest of a world of spirit situated elsewhere. To Islam matter is spirit realizing itself in space and time. Europe uncritically accepted the duality of spirit and matter probably from Manichaean thought. Her best thinkers are realizing this initial mistake today, but her statesmen are indirectly forcing the world to accept it as an unquestionable dogma. It is, then, this mistaken separation of spiritual and temporal which has largely influenced European religious and political thought, and has resulted practically in the total exclusion of Christianity from the life of European states. The result is a set of mutually ill-adjusted states dominated by interests, not human but national. And these mutually ill-adjusted states, after trampling over the moral and religious convictions of Chirstianity, are today feeling the need of a federated Europe, i.e. the need of a unity which the Christian church-organisation originally gave them, but which, instead of reconstructing in the light of Christ's vision of human brotherhood, they considered it fit to destroy under the inspiration of Luther. A Luther in the world of Islam, however, is an impossible phenomenon; for here there is no Church-organization, similar to that of Christianity in the middle ages, inviting a destroyer. In the world of Islam we have a universal polity whose fundamentals are believed to have been revealed, but whose structure, owing to our legists' want of contact with the modern world, stands today in need of renewed power by fresh adjustments. I do not know what will be the final fate of the national idea in the world of Islam. Whether Islam will assimilate and

transform it, as it has assimilated and transformed before many ideas expressive of a different spirit; or allow a radical transformation of its own structure by the force of this idea, is hard to predict. Professor Wensinck of Leiden (Holland) wrote to me the other day: "It seems to me that Islam is entering upon a crisis through which Christianity has been passing for more than a century. The great difficulty is how to save the foundations of religion when many autiquated notions have to be given up. It seems to me scarcely possible to state what the outcome will be for Christianity, still less what it will be for Islam." At the present moment the national idea is racialising the outlook of Muslims, and thus materially counteracting the humanising work of Islam. And the growth of racial consciousness may mean the growth of standards different and even opposed to the standards of Islam. I hope you will pardon me for this apparently academic discussion. To address this session of the All-India Muslim League you have selected a man who is not despaired of Islam as a living force for freeing the outlook of man from its geographical limitations, who believes that religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as states, and finally who believes that Islam is itself Destiny and will not suffer a destiny! Such a man cannot but look at matters from his own point of view. Do not think that the problem I am indicating is a purely theoretical one. It is a very living and practical problem calculated to affect the very fabric of Islam as a system of life and conduct. On a proper solution of it alone depends your future as a distinct cultural unit in India. Never in our history Islam has had to stand a greater trial than the one which confronts it today. It is open to a people to modify, reinterpret or reject the foundational principles of their social structure; but it is absolutely necessary for them to see clearly what they are doing before they undertake to try a fresh experiment. Nor should the way in which I am approaching this important problem lead anybody to think that I intend to quarrel with those who happen to think differently. You are a Muslim assembly and, I suppose, anxious to remain true to the spirit and ideals of Islam. My sole desire, therefore, is to tell you frankly what I honestly believe to be the truth about the present situation. In this way alone, it is possible for me to illuminate, according to my light, the avenues of your political action.

What, then is the problem and its implications? Is religion a private affair? Would you like to see Islam, as a moral and political ideal, meeting the same fate in the world of Islam as

Christianity has already met in Europe? Is it possible to retain Islam as an ethical ideal and to reject it as a polity in favour of national polities in which religious attitude is not permitted to play any part? This question becomes of special importance in India where the Muslims happen to be in a minority. The proposition that religion is a private individual experience is not surprising on the lips of a European. In Europe the conception of Christianity as a monastic order, renouncing the world of matter and fixing its gaze entirely on the world of spirit, led by a logical process of thought, to the view embodied in this proposition. The nature of the Prophet's religious experience, as disclosed in the Quran, however, is wholly different. It is not mere experience in the sense of a purely biological event, happening inside the experient and necessitating no reactions on its social environment. It is individual experience creative of a social order. Its immediate outcome is the fundamentals of a polity with implicit legal concepts whose civic significance cannot be belittled merely because their origin is revelational. The religious ideal of Islam, therefore, is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventualy involve the rejection of the other. Therefore, the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means a displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim. This is a matter which at the present moment directly concerns the Muslims of India. "Man", says Renan, "is enslaved neither by his race, nor by his religion, nor by the course of rivers, nor by the direction of mountain ranges. A great aggregation of men, sane of mind and warm of heart, creates a moral consciousness which is called a nation." Such a formation is quite possible, though it involves the long and arduous process of practically remaking men and furnishing them with a fresh emotional equipment. It might have been a fact in India if the teaching of Kabir and the Divine Faith of Akbar had seized the imagination of the masses of this country. Experience, however, shows that the various caste-units and religious units in India have shown no inclination to sink their respective individualities in a larger whole. Each group is intensely jealous of its collective existence. The formation of the kind of moral consciousness which constitutes the essence of a nation in Renan's sense demands a price which the peoples of India are not prepared to pay. The unity of an Indian nation, therefore, must be sought, not in the negation, but in the mutual harmony and cooperation of the many. True statesmanship cannot ignore facts, however unpleasant they may be. The only

practical course is not to assume the existence of a state of things which does not exist, but to recognize facts as they are, and to exploit them to our greatest advantage. And it is on the discovery of Indian unity in this direction that the fate of India as well as of Asia really depends. India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the East, and part with nations in the middle and west of Asia. If an effective principle of cooperation is discovered in India it will bring peace and mutual goodwill to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will at the same time solve the entire political problem of Asia.

It is, however, painful to observe that our attempts to discover such a principle of internal harmony have so far failed. Why have they failed? Perhaps, we suspect each other's intentions, and inwardly aim at dominating each other. Perhaps, in the higher interests of mutual cooperation, we cannot afford to part with the monopolies which circumstances have placed in our hands, and conceal our egoism under the cloak of a nationalism, outwardly simulating a largehearted patriotism, but inwardly as narrowminded as a caste or a tribe. Perhaps, we are unwilling to recognize that each group has a right to free development according to its own cultural traditions. But whatever may be the causes of our failure, I still feel hopeful. Events seem to be tending in the direction of some sort of internal harmony. And as far as I have been able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that, if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homelands is recognized as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India. The principle that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms. A community which is inspired by feeling of ill-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities. Nay, it is my duty, according to the teaching of the Quran, even to defend their places of worship if need be. Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour; and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture, and thereby recreating its whole past,

as a living operative factor, in my present consciousness. Even the authors of the Nehru Report recognise the value of this higher aspect of communalism. While discussing the separation of Sind they say: "To say from the larger viewpoint of nationalism that no communal provinces should be created is, in a way, equivalent to saying from the still wider international viewpoint that there should be no separate nations. Both these statements have a measure of truth in them. But the staunchest internationalist recognises that without the fullest national autonomy it is extraordinarily difficult to create the international state. So also without the fullest cultural autonomy, and communalism in its better aspect is culture, it will be difficult to create a harmonious nation."

Communalism, in its higher aspect, then, is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India. The units of Indian society are not territorial as in European countries. India is a continent of human groups belonging to different races, speaking different languages and professing different religions. Their behaviour is not at all determined by a common race-conciousness. Even the Hindus do not form a homogeneous group. The principle of European democracy cannot be applied to India without recognising the fact of communal groups. The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India is, therefore, perfectly justified. The resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference at Delhi is, to my mind, wholly inspired by this noble ideal of a harmonious whole which, instead of stifling the respective individualities of its component wholes, affords them chances of fully working out the possibilities that may be latent in them. And I have no doubt that this house will emphatically endorse the Muslim demands embodied in this resolution. Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-Government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India. The proposal was put forward before the Nehru Committee. They rejected it on the ground that, if carried into effect, it would give a very unwieldy state. This is true in so far as the area is concerned; in point of population the state contemplated by the proposal would be much less than some of the present Indian provinces. The exclusion of Ambala Division and perhaps of some districts where non-Muslims predominate

will make it less extensive and more Muslim in population—so that the exclusion suggested will enable this consolidated state to give a more effective protection to non-Muslim minorities within its area. The idea need not alarm the Hindus or the British. India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory. This centralisation of the most living portion of the Muslims of India whose military and police service has, notwithstanding unfair treatment from the British, made the British rule possible in this country, will eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia. It will intensify their sense of responsibility and deepen their patriotic feeling. Thus, possessing full opportunity ofdevelopment within the body-politic of India, the North-West Indian Muslims will prove the best defenders India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion the one of ideas or of bayonets. The Punjab, with fifty-six per cent Muslim population, supplies fifty-four per cent of the total combatant troops in the Indian army, and if the nineteen thousand Gurkhas recruited from the independent state of Nepal are excluded, the Punjab contingent amounts to sixty two per cent of the whole Indian Army. This percentage does not take into account nearly six thousand combatants supplied to the Indian Army by the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. From this you can easily calculate the possibilities of North-West Indian Muslims in regard to the defence of India against foreign aggression. The Right Hon'ble Mr Srivinasa Sastri thinks that the Muslim demand for the creation of autonomons Muslim states along the North-West border is actuated by a desire "to acquire means of exerting pressure in emergencies on the Government of India." I may frankly tell him that the Muslim demand is not actuated by the kind of motive he imputes to us; it is actuated by a genuine desire for free development which is practically impossible under the type of unitary government contemplated by the nationalist Hindu politicians with a view to secure permanent communal dominance in the whole of India.

Nor should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim states will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such states. I have already indicated to you the meaning of the word "religion", as applied to Islam. The truth is that Islam is not a church. It is state, conceived as a contractual organism long before Rousseau ever thought of such a thing, and animated by an ethical ideal which regards man not as an earth-rooted creature, defined by this or that

portion of the earth, but as a spiritual being understood in terms of a social mechanism, and possessing rights and duties as a living factor in that mechanism. The character of a Muslim state can be judged from what the Times of India pointed out sometime ago in a leader on the Indian Banking Inquiry Committee. "In ancient India", the paper points out, "the state framed laws regulating the rates of interest; but in Muslim times, although Islam clearly forbids the realization of interest on money loaned, Indian Muslim states imposed no restrictions on such rates." I, therefore, demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interests of India and Islam. For India, it means security and peace resulting from an internal balance of power; for Islam, an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times.

Thus, it is clear that in view of India's infinite variety in climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous states, based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interest, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India. The conception of federation underlying the Simon Report necessitates the abolition of the Central Legislative Assembly as a popular assembly, and makes it an assembly of the representatives of federal states. It further demands a redistribution of territory on the lines which I have indicated. And the Report does recommend both. I give my whole-hearted support to this view of the matter, and venture to suggest that the redistribution recommended in the Simon Report must fulfil two conditions. It must precede the introduction of the new constitution, and must be so devised as to finally solve the communal problem. Proper redistribution will make the question of joint and separate electorates automatically disappear from the constitutional controversy of India. It is the present structure of the provinces that is largely responsible for this controversy. The Hindu thinks that separate electorates are contrary to the spirit of true nationalism, because he understands the word "nation" to mean a kind of universal amalgamation in which no communal entity ought to retain its private individuality. Such a state of things, however, does not exist. Nor is it desirable that it should exist. India is a kind of racial and religious variety. And to this the general economic inferiority of the Muslims, their enormous debt, especially in the Punjab, and

their insufficient majorities in some of the provinces as at present constituted, and you will begin to see clearly the meaning of our anxiety to retain separate electorates. In such a country in such circumstances territorial electorates cannot secure adequate representation of all interests, and must inevitably lead to the creation of an oligarchy. The Muslims of India can have no objection to purely territorial electorates if provinces are demarcated so as to secure comparatively homogeneous communities possessing linguistic, racial, cultural and religious unity.

But insofar as the question of the powers of the Central Federal State is concerned, there is a subtle difference of motive in the constitutions proposed by the Pandits of India and the Pandits of England. The Pandits of India do not disturb the central authority as it stands at present. All that they desire is that this authority should become fully responsible to the Central Legislature which they maintain intact, and where their majority will become further reinforced on the nominated element ceasing to exist. The Pandits of England, on the other hand, realizing that democracy in the centre tends to work contrary to their interests, and is likely to absorb the whole power now in their hands, in case a further advance is made towards responsible government, have shifted the experiment of democracy from the centre to the provinces. No doubt, they introduce the principle of federation and appear to have made a beginning by making certain proposals, yet their evaluation of this principle is determined by considerations wholly different to those which determine its value in the eyes of Muslim India. The Muslims demand federation because it is pre-eminently a solution of India's most difficult problem, i.e. the communal problem. The Royal Commissioners' view of federation, though sound in principle, does not seem to aim at responsible government for federal states. Indeed, it does not go beyond providing means of escape from the situation which the introduction of democracy in India has created for the British, and wholly disregards the communal problem by leaving it where it was.

Thus it is clear that, insofar as real federation is concerned, the Simon Report virtually negatives the principle of federation in its true significance. The Nehru Report, realising Hindu majority in the Central Assembly, reaches a unitary form of government because such an institution secures Hindu dominance throughout India; the Simon Report retains the present British dominance behind the thin veneer of an unreal federation, partly because the British are naturally unwilling to part with the power

they have so long wielded, and partly because it is possible for them, in the absence of an intercommunal understanding in India, to make out a plausible case for the retention of that power in their own hands. To my mind a unitary form of government is simply unthinkable in a self-governing India. What is called "residuary powers" must be left entirely to self-governing states, the Central Federal State exercising only those powers which are expressly vested in it by the free consent of federal states. I would never advise the Muslims of India to agree to a system, whether of British or of Indian origin, which virtually negatives the principle of true federation, or fails to recognize them as a distinct political entity.

The necessity for a structural change in the Central Government was seen probably long before the British discovered the most effective means for introducing this change. That is why at rather a late stage, it was announced that the participation of the Indian Princes in the Round Table Conference was essential. It was a kind of surprise to the people of India, particularly the minorities, to see the Indian Princes dramatically expressing their willingness at the Round Table Conference to join an All-India Federation, and, as a result of their declaration, Hindu delegates—uncompromising advocates of a unitary form of government—quietly agreeing to the evolution of a federal scheme. Even Mr Sastri, who only a few days before, had severely criticised Sir John Simon for recommending a federal scheme for India, suddenly became a convert and admitted his conversion in the plenary session of the Conference—thus offering the Prime Minister of England an occasion for one of his wittiest observations in his concluding speech. All this has a meaning both for the British who have sought the participation of the Indian Princes, and the Hindus who have unhesitatingly accepted the evolution of an All-India Federation. The truth is that the participation of the Indian Princes—among whom only a few are Muslims—in a federation scheme serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it serves as an all important factor in maintaining the British power in India practically as it is, on the other hand, it gives overwhelming majority to the Hindus in an All-India Federal Assembly. It appears to me that the Hindu-Muslim differences regarding the ultimate form of the Central Government are being cleverly exploited by British politicians through the agency of the Princes who see in the scheme prospects of better security for their despotic rule. If the Muslims silently agree to any such scheme it will simply hasten their end as a political entity in India. The policy of the Indian Federation,

thus created, will be practically controlled by Hindu Princes forming the largest group in the Central Federal Assembly. They will always lend their support to the Crown in matters of Imperial concern; and insofar as internal administration of the country is concerned, they will help in maintaining and strengthening the supremacy of the Hindus. In other words the scheme appears to be aiming at a kind of understanding between Hindu, India and British Imperialism—you perpetutate me in India and I in return give you a Hindu oligarchy to keep all other Indian communities in perpetual subjection. If, therefore, the British Indian provinces are not transformed into really autonomous states, the Princes' participation in a scheme of Indian federation will be interpreted only as a dexterous move on the part of British politicians to satisfy, without parting with any real power, all parties concerned—Muslims with the word federation, Hindus with a majority in the Centre, and British Imperialists—whether Tory or Labourite—with the substance of real power.

The number of Hindu states in India is far greater than Muslim states; and it remains to be seen how the Muslim demand for 33 per cent seats in the Central Federal Assembly, is to be met with in a House or Houses constituted of representatives taken from British India as well as Indian states. I hope, the Muslim delegates are fully aware of the implications of the federal scheme as discussed in the Round Table Conference. The question of Muslim representation in the proposed All-India Federation has not yet been discussed. "The interim report," says Reuter's summary, "contemplates two chambers in the Federal Legislature—each containing representatives both of British India and States, the proportion of which will be a matter of subsequent consideration under the heads which have not yet been referred to the Sub-Committee." In my opinion the question of proportion is of the utmost importance, and ought to have been considered simultaneously with the main question of the structure of the Assembly.

The best course, I think, would have been to start with a British Indian Federation only. A federal scheme born of an unholy union between democracy and despotism cannot but keep British India in the same vicious circle of a unitary Central Government. Such a unitary form may be of the greatest advantage to the British, to the majority in British India and to the Indian Princes; it can be of no advantage to the Muslims unless they get majority rights in five out of eleven Indian Provinces with full residuary powers, and one-third share of seats in the total house of the Federal Assembly. Insofar as the attainment of

sovereign powers by the British Indian Provinces is concerned, the position of H.H. the Ruler of Bhopal, Sir Akbar Hydari and Mr Jinnah is unassailable. In view, however, of the participation of the Princes in the Indian Federation, we must now see our demand for representation in the British Indian Assembly in a new light. The question is not one of Muslim share in a British Indian Assembly, but one which relates to representation of British Indian Muslims in an All-India Federal Assembly. Our demand for 33 per cent must now be taken as a demand for the same proportion in the All-India Federal Assembly exclusive of the share allotted to the Muslim states entering the Federation.

I have thus tried briefly to indicate the way in which the Muslims of India ought, in my opinion, to look at the two most important constitutional problems of India. A redistribution of British India, calculated to secure a permanent solution of the communal problem, is the main demand of the Muslims of India. If, however, the Muslim demand of a territorial solution of the communal problem is ignored, then I support, as emphatically as possible, the Muslim demands repeatedly urged by the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference. The Muslims of India cannot agree to any constitutional changes which affect their majority rights, to be secured by separate electorates, in the Punjab and Bengal, or fail to guarantee them 33 per cent representation in any Central Legislature. There were two pitfalls into which Muslim political leaders fell. The first was the repudiated Lucknow Pact which originated in a false view of Indian nationalism, and deprived the Muslims of India from chances of acquiring any political power in India. The second is the narrow-visioned sacrifice of Islamic solidarity in the interests of what may be called "Punjab Ruralism" resulting in a proposal which virtually reduces the Punjab Muslims to a position of minority. It is the duty of the League to condemn both the Pact and the proposal.

The Simon Report does great injustice to the Muslims in not recommending a statutory majority for the Punjab and Bengal. It would either make the Muslims stick to the Lucknow Pact or agree to a scheme of joint electorates. The despatch of the Government of India on the Simon Report admits that since the publication of that document, the Muslim community has not expressed its willingness to accept any of the alternatives proposed by the Report. The despatch recognizes that it may be a legitimate grievance to deprive the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal of representation in the councils in proportion to their

population merely because of weightage allowed to Muslim minorities elsewhere. But the despatch of the Government of India fails to correct the injustice of the Simon Report. In so far as the Punjab is concerned—and this is the most crucial point—it endorses the so-called "carefully balanced scheme" worked out by the official members of the Punjab Government which gives the Punjab Muslims a majority of two over Hindus and Sikhs combined, and a proportion of 49 per cent of the House as a whole. It is obvious that the Punjab Muslims cannot be satisfied with less than a clear majority in the total House. However, Lord Irwin and his Government recognize that the justification for communal electorates for majority communities would not cease unless and until by the extension of franchise their voting strength more correctly reflects their population; and further unless a two-third majority of the Muslim members in a provincial council unanimously agree to surrender the right of separate representation. I cannot, however, understand why the Government of India, having recognized the legitimacy of the Muslim grievances, have not had the courage to recommend a statutory majority for the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal.

Nor can the Muslims of India agree to any such changes which fail to create at least Sind as a separate province, and treat the North-Western Frontier Province as a province of inferior political status. I see no reason why Sind should not be united with Baluchistan and turned into a separate province. It has nothing in common with the Bombay Presidency. In point of life and civilization the Royal Commissioners find it more akin to Mesoptamia and Arabia than India. The Muslim geographer Mas'udi noticed this kinship long ago when he said: "Sind is a country nearer to the dominions of Islam." The first Omayyad ruler is reported to have said of Egypt—"Egypt has her back towards Africa and face towards Arabia." With necessary alterations the same remark describes the exact situation of Sind. She has her back towards India and face towards Central Asia. Considering further the nature of her agricultural problems which can invoke no sympathy from the Bombay Government, and her infinite commercial possibilities, dependent on the inevitable growth of Karachi into a second metropolis of India, it is unwise to keep her attached to a Presidency which, though friendly today, is likely to become a rival at no distant period. Financial difficulties, we are told, stand in the way of separation. I do not know of any definite authoritative pronouncement on the matter. But assuming there are any such difficulties, I see no reason why the Government of India should not give

temporary financial help to a promising province in her struggle for independent progress.

As to North-Western Frontier Province, it is painful to note that the Royal Commissioners have practically denied that the people of this province have any right to reform. They fall far short of the Bray Committee, and the council recommended by them is merely a screen to hide the autocracy of the Chief Commissioner. The inherent right of the Afghan to light a cigarette is curtailed merely because he happens to be living in a powder house. The Royal Commissioners' epigrammatic argument is pleasant enough, but far from convincing. Political reform is light, not fire; and to light every human being is entitled whether he happens to live in a powder house or a coal mine. Brave, shrewd and determined to suffer for his legitimate aspirations, the Afghan is sure to resent any attempt to deprive him of opportunities of full self-development. To keep such a people contented is in the best interest of both England and India. What has recently happened in that unfortunate province is the result of a step-motherly treatment shown to the people since the introduction of the principle of Self-government in the rest of India. I only hope that British statesmanship will not obscure its view of the situation by hoodwinking itself into the belief that the present unrest in the province is due to any extraneous causes.

The recommendation for the introduction of a measure of reform in the N.-W.F.P. made in the Government of India's despatch is also unsatisfactory. No boubt, the despatch goes further than the Simon Report in recommending a sort of representative council and a semi-representative cabinet, but it fails to treat this important Muslim province on equal footing with other Indian Provinces. Indeed the Afghan is, by instinct, more fitted for democratic institutions than any other people in India.

I think I am now called upon to make a few observations on the Round Table Conference. Personally, I do not feel optimistic as to the results of this Conference. It was hoped that away from the actual scene of communal strife, and in a changed atmosphere better counsels would prevail, and a genuine settlement of the differences between the two major communities of India would bring India's freedom within sight. Actual events, however, tell a different tale. Indeed the discussion of the communal question in London has demonstrated more clearly than ever the essential disparity between the two

great cultural units of India. Yet the Prime Minister of England apparently refuses to see that the problem of India is international and not national. He is reported to have said that "his Government would find it difficult to submit to Parliament proposals for the maintenance of separate electorates, since joint electorates were much more in accordance with British democratic sentiments." Obviously, he does not see that the model of British democracy cannot be of any use in a land of many nations, and that a system of separate electorates is only a poor substitute for a territorial solution of the problem. Nor is the Minorities Sub-Committee likely to reach a satisfactory settlement. The whole question will have to go before the British Parliament; and we can only hope that the keen-sighted representatives of the British nation, unlike most of our Indian politicians, will be able to pierce through the surface of things and see clearly the true fundamentals of peace and security in a country like India. To base a constitution on the concept of a homogeneous India, or to apply to India principles dictated by British democratic sentiments, is unwittingly to prepare her for a civil war. As far as I can see, there will be no peace in the country until the various peoples that constitute India are given opportunities of free self-development on modern lines without abruptly breaking with their past.

I am glad to be able to say that our Muslim delegates fully realize the importance of a proper solution of what I call Indian international problem. They are perfectly justified in pressing for a solution of the communal question before the question of responsibility in the Central Government is finally settled. No Muslim politician should be sensitive to the taunt embodied in that propaganda word—communalism—expressly devised to exploit what the Prime Minister calls British democratic sentiments, and to mislead England into assuming a state of things which does not really exist in India. Great interests are at stake. We are seventy millions and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed, the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift. No doubt they are anxious to become a nation but the process of becoming a nation is a kind of travail, and in the case of Hindu India, involves a complete overhauling of her social structure. Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away by the subtle but fallacious argument that Turkey and Persia and other Muslim

countries are progressing on national, i.e. territorial lines. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong, in the language of the Quran, to the "people of the Book". There are no social barriers between Muslims and the "people of the Book." A Jew or a Christian or a Zoroastrian does not pollute the food of a Muslim by touching it, and the Law of Islam allows intermarriage with the "people of the Book". Indeed the first practical step that Islam took towards the realization of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. The Quran declares, "O people of the Book! Come, let us join together on the 'word' (unity of God), that is common to us all." The wars of Islam and Christianity, and, later, European aggression in its various forms, could not allow the infinite meaning of this verse to work itself our in the world of Islam. Today it is being gradually realized in the countries of Islam in the shape of what is called "Muslim Nationalism".

In conclusion, I cannot but impress upon you that the present crisis in the history of India damands complete organization and unity of will and purpose in the Muslim community, both in your own interest as a community, and in the interest of India as a whole. The political bondage of India has been and is a source of infinite misery to the whole of Asia. It has suppressed the spirit of the East, and wholly deprived her of that joy of self-expression which once made her the creator of a great and glorious culture. We have a duty towards India where we are destined to live and die. We have a duty towards Asia, especially Muslim Asia. And since seventy millions of Muslims in a single country constitute a far more valuable asset to Islam than all the countries of Muslim Asia put together, we must look at the Indian problem not only from the Muslim point of view but also from the standpoint of the Indian Muslim as such. Our duty towards Asia and India cannot be loyally performed without an organised will fixed on a definite purpose. In your own interest, as a political entity among other political entities of India, such an equipment is an absolute necessity. Our disorganised condition has already confused political issues vital to the life of the community. I am not hopeless of an intercommunal understanding, but I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action to cope with the present crisis. And an independent line of political action, in such a crisis, is possible

only to a determined purpose. Is it possible for you to achieve the organic wholeness of a unified will? Yes, it is. Rise above sectional interests and private ambitions, and learn to determine the value of your individual and collective action, however directed on material ends, in the light of the ideal which you are supposed to represent. Pass from matter to spirit. Matter is diversity; spirit is light, life and unity. One lesson I have learnt from the history of Muslims. At critical moments in their history it is Islam that has saved Muslims and not *vice versa*. If today you focus your vision on Islam and seek inspiration from the ever-vitalising idea embodied in it, you will be reassembling your scattered forces, regaining your lost integrity, and thereby saving yourself from total destruction. One of the profoundest verses in the Holy Quran teaches us that the birth and rebirth of the whole of humanity is like the birth and rebirth of a single individual. Why cannot you who, as a people, can well claim to be the first practical exponents of this superb conception of humanity, live and move and have your being as a single individual? I do not wish to mystify anybody when I say that things in India are not what they appear to be. The meaning of this, however, will dawn upon you only when you have achieved a real collective ego to look at them. In the words of the Quran, "Hold fast to yourself: no one who erreth can hurt you, provided you are well-guided." (5:104).

44

Minorities Proposals at the Round Table Conference, 1931

1. No Person shall by reason of his origin, religion, caste or creed, be prejudiced in any way in regard to public employment, office of power or honour, or with regard to enjoyment of his civic rights and the exercise of any trade or calling.

2. Statutory safeguards shall be incorporated in the constitution with a view to protect against enactments of the Legislature of discriminatory laws affecting any community.

3. Full religious liberty, that is, full liberty of belief, worship, observances, propaganda, association and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities subject to the maintenance of public order and morality.

No person shall merely by change of faith lose any civic right or privilege, or be subject to any penalty.

4. The right to establish, manage and control, at their own expense, charitable, religious and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments with the right to exercise their religion therein.

5. The constitution shall embody adequate safeguards for the protection of religion, culture and personal law, and the promotion of education, language, charitable institutions of the minority communities and for their due share in grants-in-aid given by the State and by the self-governing bodies.

6. Enjoyment of civic rights by all citizens shall be guaranteed by making any act or omission calculated to prevent full enjoyment an offence punishable by law.

7. In the formation of Cabinets in the Central Government and Provincial Governments, so far as possible, members belonging to the Mussalman community and other minorities of considerable number shall be included by convention.

8. There shall be Statutory Departments under the Central and Provincial Governments to protect minority communities and to promote their welfare.

9. All communities at present enjoying representation in any Legislature through nomination or election shall have representation in all Legislatures through separate electorates and the minorities shall have not less than the proportion set forth in the Annexure but no majority shall be reduced to a minority or even an equality. Provided that after a lapse of ten years it will be open to Muslims in Punjab and Bengal and any minority communities in any other Province to accept joint electorates, or joint electorates with reservation of seats, by the consent of the community concerned. Similarly after the lapse of ten years it will be open to any minority in the Central Legislature to accept joint electorates with or without reservation of seats with the consent of the community concerned.

With regard to the Depressed Classes no change to joint electorates and reserved seats shall be made until after 20 years' experience of separate electorates and until direct adult suffrage for the community has been established.

10. In every Province and in connection with the Central Government a Public Service Commission shall be appointed, and the recruitment to the Public Services, except the proportion if any reserved to be filled by nomination by the Governor-General and the Governors, shall be made through such Commission

in such a way as to secure a fair representation to the various communities consistently with the consideration of efficiency and the possession of the necessary qualifications. Instruction to the Governor-General and the Governors in the Instrument of Instructions with regard to recruitment shall be embodied to give effect to this principle, and for that purpose to review periodically the composition of the Services.

11. If a Bill is passed which, in the opinion of two-thirds of the members of any Legislature representing a particular community affects their religion or social practice based on religion, or in the case of fundamental rights of the subjects if one-third of the members object, it shall be open to such members to lodge their objection thereto, within a period of one month of the Bill being passed by the House, with President of the House who shall forward the same to the Governor-General or the Governor, as the case may be, and he shall thereupon suspend the operation of that Bill for one year, upon the expiry of which period he shall remit the said Bill for further consideration by the Legislature. When such Bill has been further considered by the Legislature and the Legislature concerned has refused to revise or modify the Bill so as to meet the objection thereto, the Governor-General or the Governor, as the case may be, may give or withhold his assent to it in the exercise of his discretion, provided, further, that the validity of such Bill may be challenged in the Supreme Court by any two members of the denomination affected thereby on the grounds that it contravenes one of their fundamental rights.

Special Claims of Mussalmans

1. The North-West Frontier Province shall be constituted a Governor's Province on the same footing as other Provinces with due regard to the necessary requirements for the security of the Frontier.

In the formation of the Provincial Legislature the nominations shall not exceed more than 10 per cent of the whole.

2. Sind shall be separated from the Bombay Presidency and made a Governor's Province similar to and on the same footing as other Provinces in British India.

3. Mussalman representation in the Central Legislature shall be one-third of the total number of the House, and their representation in the Central Legislature shall not be less than the proportion set forth in the Annexure.

Special Claims of the Depressed Classes

1. The constitution shall declare invalid any custom or usage by which any penalty or disadvantage or disability is imposed upon or any discrimination is made against any subject of the State in regard to the enjoyment of civic rights on account of Untouchability.

2. Generous treatment in the matter of recruitment to Public Service and the opening of enlistment in the Police and Military Service.

3. The Depressed Classes in the Punjab shall have the benefit of the Punjab Land Alienation Act extended to them.

4. Right of Appeal shall lie to the Governor or Governor-General for redress of prejudicial action or neglect of interest by any Executive Authority.

5. The Depressed Classes shall have representation not less than that set forth in the Annexure.

Special Claims of the Anglo-Indian Community

1. Generous interpetation of the claims admitted by sub-Committee No. VIII (Services) to the effect that in recognition of the peculiar position of the community special consideration should be given to the claim for public employment, having regard to the maintenance of an adequate standard of living.

2. The right to administer and control its own educational institutions, i.e. European education, subject to the control of the Minister.

Provisions for generous and adequate grants-in-aid and scholarships on the basis of present grants.

3. Jury rights to those enjoyed by other communities in India unconditionally of proof of legitimacy and descent and the right of accused persons to claim trial by either a European or an Indian jury.

Special Claims of the European Community

1. Equal rights and privileges to those enjoyed by Indian-born subjects in all industrial and commercial activities.

2. The maintenance of existing rights in regard to procedure of criminal trials, and any measure or bill to amend, alter, or modify such a procedure cannot be introduced except with the previous consent of the Governor-General.

Agreed by:

His Highness the Aga Khan (Muslims),
Dr Ambedkar (Depressed Classes),
Roa Bahadur Pannir Selvam (Indian Christians),
Sir Henry Gidney (Anglo-Indians), and
Sir Hubert Carr (Europeans).

45

Resolution passed at the twenty-second annual session of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 27 December, 1931

That this meeting of the All-India Muslim League having carefully considered the statement of the Prime Minister made at the Indian Round Table Conference on December, 1, 1931:

(*a*) Places on record its profound disappointment at the failure of the British Government to make a definite announcement that the future constitution of India shall embody such safeguards for Muslim interests as are considered necessary and adequate by the Muslim community itself.

(*b*) Places on record its regret at the provisional decision of the British Government to defer the introduction of full autonomy in provinces till the framing of All-India Constitution and urges upon the Government the necessity of immediately placing the provinces in a fully autonomous and responsible position.

(*c*) Places on record its disappointment at the failure of the British Government to make a definite announcement that Sind shall be constituted into a separate province and demands that an unconditional announcement shall be made forthwith.

(*d*) Reiterates its considered opinion that no constitution shall be acceptable to the Muslims unless it secures and guarantees to them:

(*i*) freedom of profession, practice and propaganda of religion, education, language, articles of food and social usages, etc.;

(*ii*) representation to the extent of one-third in each chamber of the Federal legislature;

(*iii*) representation in the legislature of the Provinces

where the Muslims are in a minority in accordance with the proportion of representation at present enjoyed by them in such provinces;

(*iv*) representation in the legislature of Punjab and Bengal in accordance with their proportion in the population of those provinces; and

(*v*) Fair and adequate share in public services, grants-in-aid.

That this meeting of the All-India Muslim League reiterates its considered opinion that in the future Federal Constitution of India, Residuary Powers must vest in the component units of the Federation.

That this meeting of the All-India Muslim League urges upon the British and Indian Governments the necessity of putting into immediate effect the Prime Minister's announcement regarding the N.-W.F. Province and placing it on the same footing as other governor's provinces.

46

Government's Statement on the Muslim position at the Centre, 27 December, 1932

(i) Muslim Representation in the Federal Legislature

As has been urged over and over again in the Round Table Conference and elsewhere, the Muslim community claim a one-third share in the Federal Legislature, i.e. 33 seats our of every hundred in the Lower House, and 33 seats our of every hundred in the Upper House. The community insists that of their 33 seats out of one hundred in either Houses, 25 should be guaranteed to them out of the British Indian quota.

As between British India and the Indian States, British India is on the population basis entitled to 76 seats out of a House of 100. That is why the Muslims ask for 25 or one-third of 76 seats out of the British Indian quota. Further, they ask that it should be so arranged that 8 Muslim seats out of a House of 100 are secured out of the Indian States' quota to represent Muslim interests in the Indian States.

For reasons that need not here be reitrerated, the Muslim community are opposed to the grant of any weightage to the States. The population of British India (excluding Burma) is 256,782,052, of whom 66,435,604 or 25·8 per cent are Muslims.

The population of the Indian States (excluding Burma) is 79,098,008, of whom 10,657,102, or only 13·5 per cent are Muslims. Hence any weightage granted to the States will be so much weightage for the Hindu majority and to that extent a handicap to the Muslim minority.

If on the insistence of the majority community less than 76 seats are allotted to British India and more than 24, in a House of 100, to the Indian States, then it is not the Muslims but the majority community that should make good the weightage given to predominately Hindu block.

Model of Election

For the Lower Chamber we take it for granted that the Muslim representatives will be chosen by direct election through separate Muslim constituencies.

For the Upper Chamber also the Muslim community insists that their representatives from British India should be elected through separate constituencies, i.e., by the Muslim members of the various provincial Legislatures and by them alone. The Muslim community would strongly object to any plan under which the whole of the British Indian quota for the Upper House would be elected by the provincial Legislatures voting as a body by the system of the single transferable vote. Apart from other reasons, the chief of which is the community's dislike of joint electorates in any form, their objection rests on the ground that under the most favourable conditions, such a system would not secure for them a due share in the Upper House.

(*ii*) *Residuary Powers*

The Muslims attach the greatest importance to the vesting of residuary powers in the Provinces, both in regard to legislation and taxation, because they regard this as one of their necessary safeguards. That the residuary powers of taxation should vest in the Provinces is settled, but unfortunately there has been a conflict of views in regard to the legislative field.

The arguments in support of the Muslim position need not be here re-stated. Apart from the fact that the Muslims regard it as a safeguard, this is the only arrangement which would reduce to minimum litigation regarding the validity of provincial statutes, and thus enable the constitution to work with the least possible friction.

(*iii*) *The Position of Baluchistan*

Baluchistan comprises a very large area of immense strategic

importance. The population is, no doubt, sparse, but it possesses the advantage of homogeneity and a common tribal system which is still able to carry on practically the entire local administration of the whole area.

The question of introducing a provincial autonomous form of government in Baluchistan is simplified by the very large amount of autonomy at present enjoyed by this tract through what is known as the Jirga system. This system could easily be adapted so as to form the basis of the future legislative as well as administrative system of the Province.

So far as the Federal Legislature is concerned, the share of Baluchistan as a whole should be taken proportionately out of the British Indian and Indian States' quotas, the share of British Baluchistan being taken from the British Indian and that of Kalat, Las Bela and other non-British areas from the Indian States. The existing Shahi Jirga may be enlarged and utilised both as the legislative organ of Baluchistan as a unit, and as the electorate for choosing its representatives to the Upper and Lower Federal Houses.

It may be pointed out that the exclusion of Baluchistan from the future scheme of an all-India Federation, would be both anomalous and a source of embarassment from many points of view. Having regard to the importance of Baluchistan as a Frontier Province, it would be of the greatest advantage from the political, as well as the military points of view to work Baluchistan into the fabric of the future Federation.

47

Extracts from Allama Iqbal's address at the session of the All-India Muslim Conference, Lahore, 21 March, 1932

Politics have their roots in the spiritual life of man. It is my belief that Islam is not a matter of private opinion. It is a society, or if you like, a civic church. It is because present-day political ideals, as they appear to be shaping themselves in India, may affect its original structure and character that I find myself interested in politics. I am opposed to nationalism as it is understood in Europe, not because, if it is allowed to develop in India, it is likely to bring less material gain to Muslims. I am opposed to it because I see in it the germs of atheistic materialism which I look upon as the greatest danger to modern humanity. Patriotism

is a perfectly natural virtue and has a place in the moral life of man. Yet that which really matters is a man's faith, his culture, his historical tradition. These are the things which, in my eyes, are worth living for and dying for, and not the piece of earth with which the spirit of man happens to be temporarily associated. In view of the visible and invisible points of contact between the various communities of India, I do believe in the possibility of constructing a harmonious whole whose unity cannot be disturbed by the rich diversity which it must carry within its bosom. The problem of ancient Indian thought was how the one became many without sacrificing its oneness. Today this problem has come down from its ethical heights to the grosser plane of our political life, and we have to solve it in its reversed form, i.e. how the many can become one without sacrificing its plural character. In so far then as the fundamentals of our policy are concerned, I have got nothing fresh to offer. Regarding these I have already expressed my views in my address to the All-India Muslim League. In the present address I propose, among other things, to help you, in the first place, in arriving at a correct view of the situation as it emerged from a rather hesitating behaviour of our delegation at the final stages of the deliberations of the Round Table Conference. In the second place, I shall try, according to my lights, to show how far it is desirable to construct a fresh policy now that the Premier's announcement at the last London Conference has again necessitated a careful survey of the whole situation. Let me begin with a brief history of the work of our delegation.

The first two meetings of the Minorities Committee were held on September 28 and October 1, 1931, respectively. On both occasions the meeting was adjourned for a private settlement of the communal problem. Mahatma Gandhi first told the Muslim delegation that matters could not proceed until the Muslim delegation had lifted the embargo on Dr Ansari. Failing in this, he gave the Muslim delegation to understand that he would personally agree to Muslim demands and would try to persuade the Congress, the Hindus and the Sikhs to agree to them, provided the Muslims agreed to three things: (*i*) adult suffrage; (*ii*) no special representation for the Untouchables; and (*iii*) Congress demand for complete independence. The Mahatma declined to refer the matter to the Congress and failed in his efforts to get the Hindus and the Sikhs to agree to this arrangement. On the 7th of October, two prominent Hindu leaders proposed that the whole matter might be referred to a board of seven arbitrators. This too was rejected by Hindu and Sikh

representatives. On the 8th, the Minorities Committee met for the third time. In this meeting Mahatma Gandhi set to the account of the British Government his failure to bring about a communal settlement, since, according to him, they had deliberately chosen for the British Indian delegation men who, as he said, had no representative character. On behalf of the Muslim delegation, the late Sir Mohammad Shafi refuted the Mahatma's uncalled for remarks questioning the representative character of the various delegations and opposed the proposals put forward by him. The meeting came to an end, and, owing to the British general elections, could not meet till the 12th of November. In the meantime, private conversations recommenced on the 15th of October. A prominent feature of these conversations was Sir Geoffrey Corbett's scheme relating to the Punjab. This scheme, very similar to the one I had suggested in my address to the All-India Muslim League, proposed the adoption of joint electorates with the exclusion of the Ambala Division from the Punjab. It, too, was rejected by Sikh and Hindu representatives who could not tolerate a Muslim majority in the Punjab even with a system of joint electorates. These conversations also remaining fruitless, the representatives of the Indian minorities which constitute nearly half of India, began to consult one another on the possibility of an Indian Minorities Pact. On the 12th of November all these minorities, with the exception of Sikhs, signed a pact, which was formally handed over to the British Premier in the last meeting of the Minorities Committee held on the 13th of November.

This brief account of our informal conversations speaks for itself. It is obvious that our delegates did their best to arrive at a communal settlement. The only thing which is a mystery to me, and which will perhaps ever remain a mystery, is the declaration made on the 26th of November by our spokesmen in the Federal Structure Committee to the effect that they agreed to the simultaneous introduction of provincial autonomy and central responsibility. Whether this was due to their anxiety for conciliation and political advance of the country, or to some conflicting influences which operated on their minds, I cannot say. On the 15th of November, the day on which I dissociated from our delegation, Muslim delegates had decided not to participate in the discussions of the Federal Structure Committee. Why did they participate then in these discussions contrary to their own decision? Were our spokesmen on the Federal Structure Committee authorised to make the declaration of 26th November? I am not in a position to answer these questions.

All that I can say is that the Muslim community considers the declaration a very grave error and I have no doubt that this Conference will give an emphatic expression to their views on this important matter. In my address to the All-India Muslim League, I raised my voice against the idea of an All-India federation. Subsequent events have shown that it is working only as a drag on the political advance of India. If the introduction of central responsibility is dependent on the completion of an all-India federation, which I fear will take a fairly long time, then the Government should immediately introduce responsible government in the British Indian provinces, so that the foundation thus delineated may, till the coming of central reponsibility, fully prepare itself by experience to bear the weight of the federal superstructure. A great deal of spade work is needed before we can have a really modern federal state.

I have reason to believe, and had suspected this some days before I dissociated myself from our delegations, that our spokesmen were hardly advised by certain English politicians in rejecting the immediate introduction of responsible government in the provinces of British India. Recently Lieutenant-Commander Kenworthy has expressed the same view. He says: "I understand that the moderate leaders in London were badly advised on this matter by certain English politicians, that they listened too readily to their advice and rejected the great instalment of provincial autonomy. And the curious thing is that the Mahatma was apparently ready to consider this instalment sympathetically." Who are the moderate leaders alluded to by the Lieutenant-Commander? In view of the attitude taken up by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in London and now in the Consultative Committee regarding the immediate introduction of provincial autonomy, it is obvious that the writer of the passage quoted could not have meant Hindu Liberals. I think, he probably means Muslim moderate leaders whose declaration in the Federal Structure Committee on the 26th of November seems to me to be really responsible for the British Premier's announcement regarding the simultaneous introduction of central and provincial responsibility. And since immediate introduction of responsible government in the provinces would have involved a definite announcement regarding the demands of our community as to majority rights in the Punjab and Bengal, we must not forget, while judging the present situation, that the conduct of our own leaders is mainly responsible for the British Premier's silence which has raised all sorts of suspicions in the mind of the Muslim community.

The next question is to explore the possibilities of shaping, if necessary, a new policy after the disappointing announcement made by the British Premier at the close of the last London Conference. Muslims have naturally grown apprehensive of Government's attitude towards the problem of communal settlement. They suspect that the Government will purchase Congress cooperation at any cost, and that its delay in conceding Muslim demands is only a cover for the possibility of finding some basis for negotiations with that body. The policy of trusting the Government in regard to political issues seems to be rapidly losing its hold on the mind of the community. Franchise Committee has postponed consideration of matters relating to the formation of constituencies. As for the promised provisional settlement, it is obvious that no communal settlement, provisional or permanent, can satisfy the Muslim community, which does not recognise, as its basic principle, the right of the community to enjoy majority rights in provinces where it happens to be in actual majority. The continuance of separate electorates and the status of the Frontier Province are no doubt assured, but complete provincial autonomy, transfer of power from Parliament to Indian provinces, equality of federal units, classification of subjects not into federal, central and provincial, but into federal and provincial only, majority rights in the Punjab and Bengal, unconditional separation of Sind, and one-third share in the centre, constitute no less essential elements of our demand. The Premier's silence on these points has only resulted in the unsound policy of war with the Congress and no peace with the rest of the country. Shall we then join the Congress in their present campaign? My answer without a moment's hesitation is "No". A careful reading of the underlying motives of this movement will make it perfectly clear.

To my mind this movement has its roots in fear and resentment. The Congress leaders claim that they are the sole representatives of the peoples of India. The last Round Table Conference made it abundantly clear that they were not. This they naturally resent. They know that the British people and the rest of the world now fully realise the importance of communal settlement in India. They further know that the minorities of India have arrived at a pact, and that the British Government have given a notice to enforce a provisional settlement of their own, in case the Indians themselves failed to arrive at one. The Congress leaders fear that the British Government in their provisional settlement of the communal problem may concede to the minorities what they demand. They have, therefore, started the present campaign to

bolster up a claim which has no foundation in fact, to defeat a pact which, they fear, may find a place in the coming constitution, and to force the Government to settle the matter of minorities with the Congress alone. The Congress resolution in pursuance of which the civil disobedience campaign was launched made it perfectly clear that since Government had refused to regard Mahatma Gandhi as the sole representative of the country, the Congress decided on civil disobedience. How can then a minority join a campaign which is directed as much against itself as against Government?

In the circumstances, therefore, to join the Congress in their present campaign is simply out of the question. But there is no denying that at the moment you are called upon to make important decisions. I am sure you are fully aware of the present state of the community's mind. Government's delay in conceding Muslim demands and the treatment meted out to our brave Frontier brethren on the eve of the constitutional reform in their province are making Indian Muslims suspicious of British methods; and most people are already asking the question whether the power of a third party in India does constitute a real safeguard for the Muslim minority against a politically hostile and economically exploiting majority in India. There seems to be a deeper reason also. The rapid movement of events, and often sudden changes of situation in the political world, cannot permit an Imperial democracy, especially in the case of Party Government, to adhere for any long periods of time to definite policies. Lack of imagination is a virtue rather than a fault in a modern politician. And owing to this lack of imagination which is incapable of synthesising permanence and change in a higher political concept, modern politics is driven to live from hand to mouth. In the case of a subject country like India, therefore, cooperating communities are naturally led to think that the firmness of their political attitude in difficult times for the Government may be of little or no value in the eyes of this or that political party which may come to power at any time in England. Whatever may be the character and ideals of political parties in England, you must base your policy on enlightened self-interest and conceive it in a spirit calculated to impress the whole British nation. It is folly to fight a battle in which there is likelihood of the fruits of victory going to those who are either hostile to, or have no sympathy with, our legitimate political aspirations. The present circumstances are such that in thinking out a line of policy with a view to get over the immediate difficulties of the community, it is your duty to see that

the likelihood I apprehend is eliminated, and the benefit of the action advised by you finally accrues to your community.

Let me state the position as plainly as possible. The British undertook to give a provisional decision of the communal problem in case the communities of India did not arrive at a mutual settlement after their representatives had returned from the second Round Table Conference. This undertaking was thoroughly consistent with the claim and the policy of the British as a third party holding the balance between the contending communities of India. The British Government's present attitude, however, would show that they do not mean to function as an impartial holder of balance in India, and are indirectly driving the Indian communities, which are mainly Hindus and Muslims, to a kind of civil war. We tried the majority community and found them unwilling to recognise the safeguards which we can forego at the risk of complete extinction as a nation determined to live its own life. The alternative was to hope for justice from the British, who, ever since they took the country from the Muslims, have claimed, as I have said above, to function as an impartial holder of balance in India. In their case, too, we find that the old British courage and straightforwardness are replaced by a constantly shifting policy which can inspire no confidence and seems to be calculated only to facilitate their own position in India. The Muslim community is thus brought to face the question whether it is in the interest of the community that their present policy which has so far obviated British difficulties and brought no gain to the community shall continue for any further period of time. This is a question for the open Conference to decide. All that I can say at the present stage is that, if you decide to discontinue this policy, your immediate duty is to prepare the whole community for the kind of self-sacrifice without which no self-respecting people can live an honourable life. The most critical moment in the history of the Indian Muslims has arrived. Do your duty or cease to exist.

Gentlemen, I now request you to turn for a moment to two matters of gravest concern to the Muslims of India—I mean the Frontier Province and Kashmir which, I have no doubt, are uppermost in your mind.

It is indeed gratifying to see that Government have at least conceded our demand regarding the political status of North-West Frontier Province, though it remains to be seen what this status means in the actual administration of that province. Newspaper reports show that in the matter of franchise, Government

rules have been more liberal than in other provinces. The reform machinery will, it is understood, be set in full working order from the next month. What, however, has taken grace out of the whole affair is the simultaneous launching of a campaign of repression which is not essentially different from martial law. The consideration shown in the matter of constitutional issue has been more than neutralized by the severity and short-sightedness shown in the case of the administrative issue. Government may have reasons for counteracting extremist activities of certain people in that part of the country, but it has surely not been able to defend a policy of wholesale repression. During this struggle in other parts of India Britain's dealing with the situation has not been entirely devoid of restraint. In the Frontier Province alone repression has assumed forms unworthy of a civilized Government. If oral reports are true then the heart of the British official in the Frontier Province stands in need of a reform far greater in importance for the British Empire than the constitutional reform sought to be introduced into that province. There is no definite and final information about the number of arrests and persecutions; but as it is roughly mentioned in news-papers, thousands have been arrested and convicted or interned. It is for the Government to consider whether the incongruent policies of concession and repression will result in the pacification of a proud race like the Afghan. Abdul Ghaffar Khan certainly commands a great deal of influence among the young border Afghans, but what has extended the sphere of his influence to the farthest ends of the territory and to the ignorant folk of the Frontier villages, is the present thoughtless policy of repression. Government cannot be unaware of the fact that the all-India policy of the Indian Muslims was, at this juncture, effectively keeping in check the tendencies with those who were for an unconditional alliance with the Congress. Perhaps there have been difficulties from the Government point of view; yet I think a little different handling of the administrative action could have saved the whole situation. The political situation in the Frontier, it appears, was allowed to deteriorate during the period when a policy of relaxation was the order of the day, and attempts to deal with it in a repressive manner have been made at a time when the real remedy of the disease had been prescribed. The sooner the Government withdraws all repressive measures from the province the better for the province and the Government itself. The situation has caused deep concern to the whole Muslim community in India, and it is hardly wise for the Government not to allay Muslim feeling in this respect.

As to Kashmir it is hardly necessary for me to describe the historical background of events which have recently happened in that country. The apparently sudden resurrection of a people in whom the ego-flame had been almost extinguished ought to be, in spite of the suffering which it has necessarily involved, a matter of rejoicing to all those who possess an insight into the inner struggle of modern Asiatic peoples. The cause of the people of Kashmir is absolutely just, and I have no doubt that the rebirth of this sense of reality of their own personality in an intelligent and skilful people will eventually prove a source of strength not only to the State but also to the people of India as a whole. What, however, is most deplorable is that the communal ill-feeling existing in India, and the perfectly natural sympathy of the Indian Muslims with their Kashmir brethren, led to a kind of counter-agitation among the Hindus, which in its despair, sought to protect a barbarous administration by attributing its inevitable consequences to such wild fancies as Pan-Islamic plots and conspiracies for British occupation of Kashmir. Such agitation and the communal colour thereby given to the Kashmir question could have led only to one thing—resort to violent repression leading to prolonged lawlessness in the State. In parts of the Jammu Province, as newspaper reports tell us, the administration has completely broken down and it is only the presence of British troops which is keeping things in control at least in places where they are present. Oral reports of a most violent and shameful repression practised by State authorities in many places are still pouring in. Nor can commissions of enquiry be of any help in such a state of things. The Middleton Report which admits important facts and fails to draw legitimate conclusions therefrom has already failed to satisfy Muslims. The truth is that the matter has passed the stage in which enquiries can lead to effective results. The growing sense of self-consciousness in the people all over the world is now demanding recognition in the shape of a desire for an increasing share in the administration which governs them. Political tutelage is good for a primitive people but it is in the best interests of an administration itself not to shirk from radical reform when a change in the outlook of a people demands it. Among other things which have probably arisen from the peculiar conditions obtaining in Kashmir, the people of that country demand some kind of a popular assembly. Let us hope that the ruler of the State and the Government of India will consider the people's demand as favourably as they possibly can. I have no doubt that the new Prime Minister, with charcteristic British administrative acuteness, will see into the heart of the matter, and provide scope for the activity of a fine

but down-trodden people who gave some of the best intellects to ancient India, and later added a real charm to Mughal culture. There may be difficulties in the way of constitutional reform in Kashmir as in the case of our own country, but the interests of permanent peace and order demand that these difficulties must be speedily overcome. If the meaning of the present upheaval is not properly understood and its causes are sought in directions where they cannot be found, the Kashmir Government, I fear, will have made its problem much more complicated.

It is obvious, therefore, that the attitude of the British Government towards our demands and the gravity of the situation in the Frontier Province and Kashmir claim our immediate attention. But what claims our immediate attention is not our only concern. We must have a clear perception of the forces which are silently moulding the future, and place a relatively permanent programme of work before the community in view of the probable direction of events in the country. The present struggle in India is sometimes described as India's revolt against the West. I do not think it is a revolt against the West; for the people of India are demanding the very institutions which the West stands for. Whether the gamble of elections, retinues of party leaders and hollow pageants of parliaments will suit a country of peasants to whom the money-economy of modern democracy is absolutely incomprehensible, is a different question altogether. Educated urban India demands democracy. The minorities, feeling themselves as distinct cultural units and fearing that their very existence is at stake, demand safeguards, which the majority community, for obvious reasons, refuses to concede. The majority community pretends to believe in a nationalism theoretically correct, if we start from Western premises, belied by facts, if we look to India. Thus the real parties of the present struggle in India are not England and India, but the majority community and the minorities of India which can ill-afford to accept the principle of Western democracy until it is properly modified to suit the actual conditions of life in India.

Nor do Mahatma Gandhi's political methods signify a revolt in the psychological sense. These methods arise out of a contact of two opposing types of world-conciousness, Western and Eastern. The Western man's mental texture is chronological in character. He lives and moves and has his being in time. The Eastern man's world-consciousness is non-historical. To the Western man things gradually become; they have a past, present and future. To the Eastern man they are immediately rounded off, timeless, purely present. That is why Islam which sees in the

time-movement a symbol of reality appeared as an intruder in the static world-picture of Asia. The British as a Western people cannot but conceive political reform in India as a systematic process of gradual evolution. Mahatma Gandhi as an Eastern man sees in this attitude nothing more than an ill-conceived unwillingness to part with power and tries all sorts of destructive negations to achieve immediate attainment. Both are elementally incapable of understanding each other. The result is appearance of a revolt.

These phenomena, however, are merely premonitions of a coming storm, which is likely to sweep over the whole of India and the rest of Asia. This is the inevitable outcome of a wholly political civilization which has looked upon man as a thing to be exploited and not as a personality to be developed and enlarged by purely cultural forces. The peoples of Asia are bound to rise against the acquisitive economy which the West has developed and imposed on the nations of the East. Asia cannot comprehend modern Western capitalism with its undiciplined individualism. The faith which you represent recognises the worth of the individual, and disciplines him to give away his all to the service of God and man. Its possibilities are not yet exhausted. It can still create a new world where the social rank of man is not determined by his caste or colour or the amount of dividend he earns, but by the kind of life he lives; where the poor tax the rich, where human society is founded not on the equality of stomachs but on the equality of spirits, where an Untouchable can marry the daughter of a king, where private ownership is a trust and where capital cannot be allowed to accumulate so as to dominate the real procedure of wealth. This superb idealism of your faith, however, needs emancipation from the medieval fancies of theologians and legists. Spiritually we are living in a prison-house of thoughts and emotions which during the course of centuries we have woven round ourselves. And be it further said to the shame of us—men of older generation—that we have failed to equip the younger generation for the economic, political and even religious crises that the present age is likely to bring. The whole community needs a complete overhauling of its present mentality in order that it may again become capable of feeling the urge of fresh desires and ideals. The Indian Muslim has long ceased to explore the depths of his own inner life. The result is that he has ceased to live in the full glow and colour of life, and is consequently in danger of an unmanly compromise with forces which, he is made to think, he cannot vanquish in open conflict. He who desires to change an unfavourable environment must

undergo a complete transformation of his inner being. God changeth not the condition of a people until they themselves take the initiative to change their condition by constantly illuminating the zone of their daily activity in the light of a definite ideal. Nothing can be achieved without a firm faith in the independence of one's own inner life. This faith alone keeps a people's eyes fixed on their goal and saves them from perpetual vacillation. The lesson that past experience has brought to you must be taken to heart. Expect nothing from any side. Concentrate your whole ego on your self alone, and ripen your clay into real manhood if you wish to see your aspirations realized. Mussolini's maxim was: "He who has steel has bread." I venture to modify it a bit and say: "He who is steel has everything." Be hard and work hard. This is the whole secret of individual and collective life. Our ideal is well defined. It is to win in the coming constitution a position for Islam which may bring her opportunities to fulfil her destiny in this country. It is necessary in the light of this ideal to rouse the progressive forces of the community and to organise their hitherto dormant energies. The flame of life cannot be borrowed from others; it must be kindled in the temple of one's own soul.

48

The Communal Award announced by the British Prime Minister, Mr Ramsay MacDonald, 1932

(1) In the statement made by the Prime Minister in December last, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, at the close of the second session of the Round Table Conference, which was immediately afterwards endorsed by both Houses of Parliament, it made plain that, if the communities in India were unable to reach a settlement acceptable to all parties on communal questions which the Conference had failed to solve, His Majesty's Government were determinded that India's constitutional advance should not on that account be frustrated, and they would remove this obstacle by devising and applying themselves to a provisional scheme.

(2) On March 19 last, His Majesty's Government, having been informed that the continued failure of the communities to reach an agreement was blocking the progress of plans for the framing of the new constitution, stated that they were engaged upon a careful re-examination of the difficult and controversial

questions which arise. They are not satisfied that, without the decision of at least some aspects of the problems connected with the position of the minorities under the new constitution no further progress can be made with the framing of the constitution.

(3) His Majesty's Government have accordingly decided that they will include provisions to give effect to the scheme set out below in the proposals relating to the Indian constitution to be laid in due course before Parliament. The scope of this scheme is purposely confined to the arrangements to be made for the representation of British Indian communities in Provincial legislatures, consideration of representation in the Legislature at the Centre being deferred for the reason given in paragraph 20 below. The decision to limit the scope of the scheme does not imply a failure to realise that the framing of the constitution will necessitate the decision of a number of other problems of great importance to minorities, but has been taken in the hope that, once a pronouncement has been made upon the basic question of the method and proportions of representation, the communities themselves may find it possible to arrive at a *modus vivendi* on the other communal problems which have not as yet received the examination they required.

(4) His Majesty's Government wish it to be most clearly understood that they themselves can be no parties to any negotiations which may be initiated with a view to the revision of their decision, and will not be prepared to give consideration to any representation aimed at securing a modification of it, which is not supported by all parties affected. But they are most desirous to close no door to an agreed settlement, should such happily be forthcoming. If, therefore, before the new Government of India Act is passed into law, they are satisfied that the communities who are concerned are mutually agreed upon a practicable alternative scheme, either in respect of any one or more of the Governor's Provinces, or in respect of the whole of British India, they will be prepared to recommend to Parliament that the alternative should be substituted for the provisions now outlined.

(5) Seats in the Legislative Councils in Governor's Provinces or in the Lower House, if there is an Upper Chamber, will be allocated as shown in para. 24 below.

(6) Election to the seats allotted to Muslim, European and Sikh constituencies will be by voters voting in separate communal electorates, covering between them the whole area of the Pro-

vinces (apart from any portions which may, in special cases, be excluded from the electoral area as "backward".)

Provision will be made in the constitution itself to empower revision of this electoral arrangement and other similar arrangements mentioned below after ten years, with the assent of the communities affected, for the ascertainment of which suitable means will be devised.

(7) All qualified electors, who are not voters, either in a Muslim, Sikh, Indian Christian (see para. 10), Anglo-Indian (see para. 11) or European constituency, will be entitled to vote in a general constituency.

(8) Seven seats will be reserved for Marhattas in certain selected plural member general constituencies in Bombay.

(9) Members of the "Depressed Classes" qualified to vote will vote in a general constituency. In view of the fact that, for a considerable period, these classes would be unlikely, by this means alone, to secure any adequate representation in a legislature, a number of special seats will be assigned to them as shown in para. 24 below. These seats will be filled by elections from special constituencies in which only members of the "Depressed Classes" electorally qualified will be entitled to vote. Any person voting in such special constituency will, as stated above, be also entitled to vote in general constituency. It is intended that these constituencies should be formed in selected areas where the "Depressed Classes" are most numerous, and that, except in Madras, they should not cover the whole area of the province.

In Bengal, it seems possible that, in some general constituencies the majority of voters will belong to the Depressed Classes. Accordingly, pending further investigation, no number has been fixed for members to be returned from special Depressed Classes constituencies in that Province. It is intended to secure that the Depressed Classes should obtain not less than ten seats in the Bengal Legislature.

The precise definition in each Province of those who (if electoraly qualified) will be entitled to vote in special Depressed Class constituencies has been finally determined. It would be passed as a rule on the general principles advocated in the Franchise Committee's Report. Modification may, however, be found necessary in some Provinces in Northern India where the application necessary of the general criteria of "untouchability" might result in a definition unsuitable in some respects to the

special conditions of the Province.

His Majesty's Government do not consider that these special Depressed Classes constituencies will be required for more than a limited time. They intend that the constitution shall provide that they shall come to an end after twenty years, if they have not previously been abolished under the general powers of electoral revision referred to in para. 6.

(10) Election to the seats allotted to Indian Christians will be by voters voting in separate communal electorates. It seems almost certain that the formation of Indian Christian constituencies covering the whole area of a province will be impracticable and that, accordingly, special Indian Christian constituencies will have to be formed only in one or two selected areas in a Province, Indian Christian voters in these areas will not vote in a general constituency. Indian Christian voters outside these areas will vote in a general constituency, special arrangements may be needed in Bihar and Orissa, where a considerable proportion of the Indian Christian Community belongs to aboriginal tribes.

(11) Election to seats allotted to Anglo-Indians will be by voters voting in separate communal electorates. It is at present intended, subject to investigation of any practical difficulties that may arise, that Anglo-Indian constituencies shall cover the whole area of each Province, postal ballot being employed; but no final decision has yet been reached.

(12) The method of filling seats assigned for representatives from backward areas is still under investigation, and the number of seats so assigned should be regarded as provisional pending final decision as to the constitutional arrangements to be made in relation to such areas.

(13) His Majesty's Government attach great importance to securing that the new legislatures should contain at least a small number of women members. They feel that, at the outset, this object could not be achieved without creating a certain number of seats specially allotted to women. They also feel it is essential that women members should not be drawn disproportionately from one community. They have been unable to find any system which would avoid this risk, and would be consistent with the rest of the scheme for representation which they have found it necessary to adopt, except that of limiting the electorate for each special women's seat to voters from one community, subject to the exception explained in para. 24 below. Special women's seats have accordingly been specifically divided, as explained in para. 24

between the various communities. The precise electoral machinery to be employed in these special constituencies is still under consideration.

(14) Seats allotted to "Labour" will be filled from non-communal constituencies. Electoral arrangements have still to be determined, but it is likely that, in most Provinces Labour constituencies will be partly Trade Union and Partly special constituencies, as recommended by the Franchise committee.

(15) Special seats allotted to Commerce and Industry, Mining and Planting will be filled by election through Chamber of Commerce and various Associations. Details of the electoral arrangements for these seats must await further investigation.

(16) Special seats allotted to Landholders will be filled by election by special Landholders constituencies.

(17) The method to be employed for election to University seats is still under consideration.

(18) His Majesty's Government have found it impossible, in determining these questions of representation in provincial legislatures, to avoid entering into considerable detail. There remains, nevertheless, the determination of the constituencies. They intend that this task should be undertaken in India as early as possible.

It is possible, in some instances, delimitation of constituencies might be materially improved by a slight variation from the number of seats now given. His Majesty's Government reserve the right to make such slight variation for such purpose, provided they will not materially affect the essential balance between the communities. No such variations will, however, be made in the case of Bengal and the Punjab.

(19) The question of the composition of second Chambers in the provinces has so far received comparatively little attention in the constitutional discussions and requires further consideration before a decision is reached which provinces shall have a second Chamber or a scheme is drawn up for their composition.

His Majesty's Government consider that the composition of the Upper House in a Province should be such as not to disturb, in any essential, the balance between the communities resulting from the composition of the Lower House.

(20) His Majesty's Government do not propose at present to enter into the question of size and composition of the Legislature at the Centre, since this involves, among other questions,

that of representation of Indian States, which still needs further discussion. They will, of course, when considering the composition, pay full regard to the claims of all communities for adequate representation therein.

(21) His Majesty's Government have already accepted the recommendation that Sind should be constituted a separate Province, if satisfactory means of financing it can be found. As the financial problems involved still have to be reviewed in connection with other problems of federal finance, His Majesty's Government have thought it preferable to include, at this stage, figures for a legislature for the existing Provinces of Bombay, in addition to the scheme for separate legislatures for the Bombay Presidency proper and Sind.

(22) The figures given for Bihar and Orissa relate to the existing Province. The question of constituting a separate Province of Orissa is still under consideration.

(23) The inclusion, in para. 24 below, of figures relating to the legislature for the Central Provinces, including Berar, does not imply that any decision had yet been reached regarding the future constitutional position of Berar.

(24) The following will be the allocation of seats in Provincial Legislatures (Lower House only):

MADRAS

General seats (including 6 women)	-	134
Depressed Classes	-	18
Representative from backward areas	-	1
Muslims (including 1 woman)	-	29
Indian Christians (including 1 woman)	-	9
Anglo-Indians	-	2
Europeans	-	3
Commerce and Industry, Mining and Planting	-	6
Landholders	-	1
University	-	1
Labour	-	6
	Total	210

BOMBAY
(Including Sind)

General seats (including 5 women)	-	97

Depressed Classes	-	10
Backward Areas	-	1
Muslims (including 1 woman)	-	63
Indian Christians	-	3
Anglo-Indians	-	2
Europeans	-	4
Commerce etc.	-	8
Landholders	-	3
University	-	1
Labour	-	8
	Total	200

BENGAL

General seats (including 2 women)	-	80
Depressed Classes	-	—
Muslims (including 2 women)	-	119
Indian Christians	-	2
Anglo-Indians (including 1 woman)	-	4
Europeans	-	11
Commerce etc.	-	19
Landholders	-	5
University	-	2
Labour	-	8
	Total	250

UNITED PROVINCES

General seats (including 4 women)	-	132
Depressed Classes	-	12
Muslims (including 2 women)	-	66
Indian Christians	-	2
Anglo-Indians	-	1
Europeans	-	2
Commerce etc.	-	3
Landholders	-	6
University	-	1
Labour	-	3
	Total	228

PUNJAB

General seats (including 1 woman)	- 43
Sikhs (including 1 woman)	- 32
Muslims (including 2 women)	- 86
Indian Christians	- 2
Anglo-Indian	- 1
Europeans	- 1
Commerce etc.	- 1
Landholders	- 5
University	- 1
Labour	- 3
Total	175

BIHAR AND ORISSA

General seats (including 3 women)	- 99
Depressed Classes	- 7
Representatives from Backward Areas	- 8
Muslims (including 1 woman)	- 42
Indian Christians	- 2
Anglo-Indians	- 1
Europeans	- 2
Landholders	- 5
Commerce etc.	- 4
University	- 1
Labour	- 4
Total	175

CENTRAL PROVINCES
(Including Berar)

General seats (including 3 women)	- 77
Depressed Classes	- 10
Representative from Backward Areas	- 1
Muslims	- 14
Anglo-Indians	- 1
Europeans	- 1
Commerce etc.	- 2

Landholders	-	3
University	-	1
Labour	-	2
	Total	112

ASSAM

General seats (including 1 woman)	-	44
Depressed Classes	-	4
Representatives from Backward Areas	-	9
Muslims	-	34
Indian Christians	-	1
Europeans	-	1
Commerce etc.	-	11
Labour	-	4
	Total	108

NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE

General seats	-	9
Sikhs	-	3
Muslims	-	36
Landholders	-	2
	Total	50

Seats are also allocated for Bombay without Sind and for Sind as follows:

BOMBAY
(Without Sind)

General seats (including 5 women)	-	109
Depressed Classes	-	10
Representative from Backward Areas	-	1
Muslims (including 1 woman)	-	30
Indian Christians	-	3
Anglo-Indians	-	2
Europeans	-	3
Commerce etc.	-	7

Landholders	-	2
Labour	-	7
University	-	1
	Total	175

SIND

General seats (including 1 woman)	-	19
Muslims (including 1 woman)	-	34
Europeans	-	2
Commerce etc.	-	2
Landholders	-	2
Labour	-	1
	Total	60

As regards seats for Commerce and Industry, Mining and Planting, it is stated that the composition of bodies through which election of these seats will be conducted, though in most cases either predominantly European or predominantly Indian, will not be statutorily fixed. It is accordingly not possible in each province to state with certainty how many Europeans and Indians respectively will be returned.

It is, however, expected that, initially, the number will be approximately as follows:

Madras: 4 Europeans and 2 Indians.

Bombay (including Sind): 5 Europeans and 3 Indians.

Bengal: 14 Europeans and 5 Indians.

United Provinces: 2 Europeans and 1 Indian.

Punjab: 1 Indian.

Bihar and Orissa: 2 Europeans and 2 Indians.

Central Provinces (including Berar): 1 European and 1 Indian.

Assam: 8 Europeans and 3 Indians.

Bombay (without Sind): 4 Europeans and 3 Indians.

Sind: 1 European and 1 Indian.

As regards general seats allocated to Bombay, whether inclusive or exclusive of Sind, it is stated seven of them will be reserved for Marhattas.

As regards allocation of seats for Depressed Classes in Bengal this number which will not exceed ten, has not yet been fixed. The number of general seats will be thirty, less the number of special Depressed Classes seats.

As regards Landholders seats in the Punjab, it is stated one of these will be a "Zamindar's" seat. Four Landholders seats will be filled from special constituencies with joint electorates. It is probable from distribution of the electorate that the members returned will be one Hindu, one Sikh and two Muslims.

As regards allocation of one woman's seat among general seats in Assam, it is stated this will be filled from a non-communal constituency at Shillong.

49

Allama Iqbal's statement on the Communal Award, 24 August, 1932

The decision of His Majesty's Government has invoked divergent criticism characteristic of this land of minorities. This in itself ought to be instructive to those fact-shy politicians who take an easy view of the complexity of the Indian constitutional problem and think that India possesses, or is capable of possessing, on the whole a single national point of view. And all this unhappy fire-work of phrases comes from people who openly confessed their inability to solve their own problems in requesting a third party to give them a decision which, be it remembered, does not close the door for an agreed settlement.

Amidst this welter of indiscriminate criticism, however, a disinterested student of Indian politics will find great relief in reading the views of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru—the acute politician who combines a clear vision of present actualities with a penetrating glance into the future and shows infinite patience in working out the minute details of a complex situation.

I may also recall the amusing observation made in this connection by a gentleman of Bombay who said that the British Government's decision might as well have been written by myself. I assure him that if I had been called upon to give a decision on the Indian communal problem, I should not have done such glaring injustice to Muslims as the present decision does.

I honestly believe that no community has a more genuine grievance against the decision than Muslims. Indeed, I cannot

explain to myself how the British conscience has tolerated this injustice.

The outcry that the decision has given a majority representation to Punjab Muslims has absolutely no justification. A Muslim majority, whatever its character, in this province ought not to form a ground of grievance for any community. Besides, in the present case this majority has been made dependent on Muslims winning a number of seats through joint electorates.

The views of the Indian Muslims on the British Government's decision are embodied in the resolution adopted by the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference at Delhi the other day. I need not repeat them. But it appears from a careful study of the decision that it attempts to vindicate two political principles, i.e. no majority should be reduced to a minority and the interests of the minorities should be protected by giving them suitable weightage. In the application of both these principles it is the Muslims who suffer.

The position of Muslims in Bengal proves the violation of the first principle to the detriment of the Muslims and the figures relating to the weightage given to minorities in various provinces prove that the second principle has been applied more generously to Hindus in the Frontier Province than to Muslims in any other province. In the Punjab the Sikh minority has been given weightage to an extent which reduces the probable Muslim majority to the narrowest possible margin.

The Muslims of Bengal who have been given 48·4 instead of 61 per cent needed only another 2 per cent to ensure an odd majority for them. But His Majesty's Government have thought fit to observe the terms of the Minorities Pact as far as it related to Europeans and to ignore it as far as it related to Bengal Muslims. Is it because blood is thicker than water or because this injustice to Muslims serves the double object of helping the Europeans and pleasing the Hindus?

The important question for Muslims, however, is what is to be done? I believe that perfectly constitutional method is open to Muslims to adopt in this connection. Bengal is one of those provinces which have demanded two Houses of Legislature. The constitution of an Upper House for it is yet to be framed and what the relations between the two Houses will be and whether the Government will be responsible to the Lower House only or to both Houses put together, are questions which are yet to be settled. If representation on a population basis is secured for

Muslims in the Upper House and if Government is made responsible to both Houses put together, Muslims may still have a majority in that province. In view of the fact that special interest has received full attention in the Lower House the above method will only do bare justice to Bengal Muslims.

I must add that the mere allotment of seats to various communities is in itself of no great consequence. What is vital is the amount of power which may be transferred to the provinces of India, if real power comes to the provinces, there is no doubt that the minorities in India, Muslims and non-Muslims, will have an opportunity of improving their political position in the country and that in working out the coming constitution, Muslims in their majority provinces will, in view of their past history and traditlons, prove themselves free from all pettiness of mind and narrowness of outlook. Their one duty, to my mind, is a war against illiteracy and economic slavery.

50

Resolutions passed at the twenty-second session of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 26 November, 1933

Whereas owing to the failure of the two majority communities inhabiting India, viz. the Hindus and the Muslims to come to an agreement, His Majesty's Government was forced to give a decision relating to some matters between the parties and though the decision falls far short of the Muslim demands the Muslims have accepted it in the best interests of the country reserving to themselves the right to press for the acceptance of all their demands, this meeting of the All-India Muslim League condemns the activities of those who are trying to alter the decision in such a manner as to deprive the Muslims of those rights which have already been conceded to them and considers that the best course for all the communities is to work together for the salvation of the country in the spirit of "give and take" with a view to securing mutual confidence and goodwill and strongly urges upon the Joint Parliamentary Committee to uphold the communal decision of His Majesty's Government.

This meeting of the All-India Muslim League considers it absolutely essential for the proper representation of important and principal religious minorities in the Government of the Provinces and the Centre that the Governor or the Governor-General

should be enjoined to use his discretion in selecting his ministers in such a way that the following results may be obtained viz.—

(*a*) Important and principal religious moinorities may have their adequate representation.

(*b*) The Minister or Ministers selected must have the largest following in the particular legislature of members of his own community.

In this connection this meeting notes with satisfaction that the evidence given by the Secretary of State for India before the Joint Parliamentary Committee on 11th July, 1933 in regard to these points is very helpful.

This Session of the All-India Muslim League places on record its emphatic protest against the policy of the British Government in trying to make Palestine the National Home of the Jews and requests H.E. the Viceroy to represent to His Majesty's Government the feelings of the Muslims of India that the Balfour Declaration be immediately withdrawn as it is opposed to the fundamental rights of the people entrusted to their control.

That this Session of the All-India Muslim League is strongly of the opinion that for the success of the new constitution it is essential that the Muslim demands which yet remain to be met in respect of the following matters be provided for in the new constitution:

(1) Allotment of the Muslim seats, as 1/3rd of either of the two houses in the Central legislature.

(2) Provision for adequate representation of the Muslims from special constituencies.

(3) Election to the Federal Upper House by direct method and separate electorate.

(4) Declaration of fundamental rights relating to the Muslim personal law; establishment of Qazi's courts in matter involving Muslim rites and usages.

(5) Adequate repesentation of Muslims in Orissa after its separation from Behar.

(6) Provision for restraining legislation if 3/4th of the members of any particular community oppose the passage of a bill as adversely affecting their religion or their special rights under the constitution.

(7) Reforms in Baluchistan.

This meeting of the All-India Muslim League, having taken

into consideration the letter addressed to its President by certain Muslim leaders of the Punjab suggesting that advantage should be taken of the expected presence in this country of H.H. the Aga Khan and Mr M.A. Jinnah to hold a convention at some suitable place for the purpose of bringing about unity in the ranks of the League, expresses full concurrence in the spirit of this proposal, and its readiness to accept at all times and under all circumstances the guidance and advice of such revered and trusted leaders of the community as the two above-named gentlemen, and authorises the Council to take such steps in this direction as may be possible and desirable in consultation with H.H. the Aga Khan and Mr M.A. Jinnah.

Resolved that in the new constitution residuary powers should be vested with the components units of the Federation in order to bring all provinces and Indian States on a footing of equality in the Federation.

51

Mr M. A. Jinnah's speech on the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report in the Legislative Assembly and his amendments, 7 February, 1935

Sir, on an occasion of such grave importance, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the attacks and misrepresentations that have been made with regard to my position regarding this question, and I think the House will bear with me for a few minutes. A newspaper, of the standing and position like the Statesman, has, in its recent issue dated the 2nd February, stated this :

"Race hatred is the prime mover of the Congress Party which has an important following. No doubt they will always find fortuitous allies like Mr Jinnah."

Sir, I repel that with all the power that I can command ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches) I bear no race hatred of any kind whatsoever to any race. (Hear, hear).

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkhund and Kumaon Divisions; Muhammadan Rural): Shame to that paper!

Mr M.A. Jinnah: Then the paper proceeds further and says this:

"Mr Jinnah, who started as a keen Round Tabler, an enthusiastic Federalist—"

—Yes I admit, Sir, I was not only a keen Round Tabler but, if I may say so, I was the keenest Round Tabler, but I did not start as an enthusiastic Federalist. From the very commencement, rightly or wrongly, I knew that the scheme would never materialise in a manner which would satisfy the legitimate aspirations of India. Then this paper further on says:

"Is now" (that is) "dissatisfied, because he was not invited to the later stittings of the Conference."

Several Honourable Members: Shame, shame!

Mr M.A. Jinnah: I was not invited to the later sittings of the Conference because I was the strongest opponent of the scheme, that was being constructed, from the commencement, and not that I have become an opponent because I was not invited to the Third Round Table Conference. Sir, these lies, these insinuations, these reflections are not worthy of any newspaper worth the name . . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I hope the Honourable Member is not associating me with those remarks, because he keeps on looking at me. I had nothing to do with it. May I assure my friend that I have not even read what he has just read out. I never heard of the article before, and this is the first time I hear it from my Honourable friend.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Now, probably, the Honourable the Home Member will associate himself with what Mr Jinnah has said against that newspaper.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: Well, Sir, I will leave it at that. I do not for a moment include the Honourable the Home Member in the criticism I have made, or for the matter of that, I do not include any other Englishman, except the writer of that article.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I know nothing about it.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: I will say no more about it for the moment.

Coming, Sir, to the question before the House, first I shall deal with some of the observations that fell from my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Desai. Sir, I do not agree with his amendment. His first amendment is a flat rejection. I admit that I do not dispute it, and I don't think he disputes it either; it is a flat rejection, because he asks that no legislation shall be proceeded with based on the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report. That means that if we accept it, everything goes, and I think he will also admit that nothing remains, even

his neutrality in regard to the Communal Award goes. Is that the reason why he, having taken up the position that it should be thrown out lock, stock and barrel, says in the second part of his amendment that he is neutral to the Communal Award? Now, Sir, I cannot accept his view. He has no alternative either, and, therefore, it is a pure and simple negative position, and I cannot subscribe to that position. That is the reason, Sir, why I have been compelled to put forward my amendment. My amendment accepts the Communal Award,—and, remember, until when,—until a substitute is agreed upon between the communities concerned. Now, it may be that our Hindu friends are not satisfied with the Communal Award, but at the same time I can also tell the House that my Muslim friends are not satisfied with it either (Hear, hear), because it does not meet their full demand. And speaking for myself, personally, I am not satisfied with the Communal Award (Hear, hear), and, again speaking as an individual, my self-respect will never be satisfied until we produce our own scheme. (An Honourable Member: "Very good of you.") (Hear, hear). Do not relegate me only to God, but take the man into consideration also. But why do I accept it? I do not want to go into the past history, but I can tell the House that I accept it because we have done everything that we could so far to come to a settlement, and though, so far, we have not been able to come to a settlement, and, therefore, whether I like it or whether I do not like it, I accept it, because unless I accept that, no scheme of Constitution is possible. ("Hear, hear" from Official Benches). Therefore, please stop this talk of rejection now. For the time being let it stand. I entirely reciprocate every sentiment which the honourable the Leader of the Opposition expressed, and I agree with him that religion should not be allowed to come into politics, that race should not be allowed to come into politics. Language does not matter so much, I agree with him, if taken singly one by one. Religion is merely a matter between man and God, I agree with him there entirely, but I ask him to consider this,—is this a question of religion purely? Is this a question of language purely? No, Sir, this is a question of minorities and it is a political issue. (Some Muslim Honourable Member: "Civilisatlon and culture.") Have not those problems been faced and soived?—and this problem must also be faced and solved. Now, what are the minorities? Minorities mean a combination of things. It may be that a minority has a different religion from the other citizens of a country. Their language may be different, their race may be different, their culture may be different, and the combination of all these various elements—religion, culture, race, language, art, music, and so forth makes the minority a separate

entity as an entity wants safeguards. Surely, therefore, we must face this question as a political problem; we must solve it and not evade it.

Then my Honourable friend laid down the proposition: acquisition first and distribution afterwards. There is a great fallacy, if I may say so most respectfully, in that statement. This is not a question of acquisition and distribution. It is not that we are acquiring some land, it is not that we are going to enter upon a venture and then we share or distribute the spoils. But, may I know, if that proposition is correct, why did Mahatma Gandhi fast unto death and come to an agreement with the sanction and concurrence of all leaders from India and arrive at the Poona Pact as regards the Depressed Classes? (Hear, hear.) Why were they not told, acquisition first and distribution afterwards? (Hear, hear.) Mahatma Gandhi was right. He knew, and they are drawn from your race, they are Hindus, 50 or 60 millions of Hindus. He was right, and I agree with him. I begged of him in England. First he said: "No, I will not divide the Hindus. I will never agree to this." I begged of him. Believe me, I pleaded more for the Depressed Classes before Mahatma Gandhi than I did for the Mussalmans. But he was adamant, but ultimately he did realise, and I congratulate my Hindu brethren that they have, by recognising and giving this protection and safeguard to the Depressed Classes, won them over, and today he is still working for their amelioration. Show us the same spirit, join hands with us and we are ready. (Hear, hear) I will say no more about the Communal Award.

Now I come to the question of my amendment. Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the House was very hard to me. He said, he understood the straightforward, honest amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, but he said that mine was a disingenuous . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Crooked and tortuous.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: He reminded me of a petty court where a petty lawyer, when he has got a bad case, abuses the other side. So he started by abusing me. He never told me why it was crooked, why it was tortuous, and why it was disingenuous.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I will tell you at 3-30.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: Ah! That is the game, that is adopting tactics which are not fair in this House. It may have been all right if he was in the High Court working for a reply. I want

Government to put their cards on the table and tell me on what grounds you say that my amendment is disingenuous, tortuous and crooked. . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Grounds I have stated.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: You have not stated. What does he say? "Mr Jinnah, by his amendment"—I suppose he meant No. 3, he could not have meant No. 2,—he said, "if the third amendment of Mr Jinnah was carried, what would happen?" He said, "What he wants us to do is this. He wants to destroy the foundation, he wants to keep the upper storey and wants us to change the glasses and windows." Is that your answer? Have you studied your own Bill? There is no foundation that we can talk of except one, and there is no storey, and the only storey is the pretty story of the Law Member about glasses and windows. Go and deliver those stories to the children! (Laughter.) There is no such thing as a storey here, and I shall illustrate it to the House. Let us examine this thing. Now, what are we doing? We are building a constitutional scheme for the provinces first, then we are building a scheme for the Central Government, it is all ground floor, there is no storey. I was threatened further, if the third amendment of mine were carried, the whole Bill would drop. But what does the Bill itself do? What does the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report itself say? It says that, in the first instance, Provincial Autonomy will come into being as soon as this Bill is passed, or very soon after it. But the Federation is not coming into being. It may take two years, it may take three years, it may take five years and they have laid down in this very report and the White Paper proposals that there may be difficulties after the Provincial Autonomy has come into being in full working order. There may be difficulties, and there are various other conditions which have got to be complied with. They have got to get the assent of the princes, they have got to get the instruments of accession, they have got other things to do. Then, at page 286 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, we find this:

"It is probable that it will be found convenient, or even necessary, that the new Provincial Governments should be brought into being in advance of the changes in the Central Government and the entry of the States. But the coming into being of the autonomous Provinces will only be the first step towards the complete Federation for which the Constitution Act will provide; and His Majesty's Government have stated that if causes beyond their control should place obstacles in the way of this programme, they will take steps to review the whole position in consultation with Indian opinion.

"Provision will, accordingly be required in the Constitution Act for the period, however short it may be, by which Provincial Autonomy may precede the complete establishment of the Federation. The nature of transitory arrangements contemplated for this purpose is explained in paragraph 202 of the Proposals."

And that is provided in the Bill itself. Therefore, the question of Federation coming into being still is suspended, it is subject to the vote of the two Houses of Parliament and is subject to various other conditions which will have to be complied with. Now, my reply to you is this. Please stop this scheme,—remember, I want to emphasise—this scheme of Federation, stop it. I do not want to wait for those conditions to arise. The conditions have already arisen in my judgment, and I say, stop this. What are the conditions that have arisen? The conditions that have arisen are these. I have seen your scheme and it is thoroughly rotten, fundamentally had and totally unacceptable. (An Honourable Member: "Why?") Why, am I to be told that the whole Bill will be dropped! That is what I want to know. And now I will tell you why I object to the Central scheme. I object to the Central scheme first. Take your own words: Sir, not as the President but as a public man, as a prominent Leader and a Leader of the Independent Party. This is what you said: "The scheme is wholly unnatural, artificial and unknown to any Constitution." I would add to that—It is devoid of all basic and essential elements and the fundamental requirements which are necessary to form any Federarion. My second ground is that it proposes the entry of the princes on terms and conditions laid down by them, as *sine qua non* and as conditions precedent, and which are, on the face of them, most detrimental to the vital interests of British India. There may be an impression that I am against the princes. I am not against the princes. I am not against anybody. I am for British India. It is not that I do not wish to have anything to do with the princes. I have said it over and over again that I am not opposed to all-India Federation and the Honourable the Home Member very rightly said that even Mahatma Gandhi was not opposed to all-India Federation. What follows from that? When I say that I am not oppossed to all-India Federation, does it follow from that that you are to hold me to any scheme of all-India Federation that you laid down, however bad and, however unacceptable it may be? Is that the argument? The point is not that we are opposed to all-India Federation but what kind of all-India Federation? I say, standing on the floor of the House, that I do not preclude myself from considering any alternative scheme of all-India Federation which

I think is in the interests of British India, and I shall be only too glad if I am satisfied that it is good to accept it. I know this also that, having regard to these impossible terms, which the princes have laid down, it is impossible to construct any kind of Federation with its name, and, therefore, I say it is no use going on like this. We have gone on for four years. On the one hand, the princes have laid down their definite ultimatum—this and no more. On the other hand the British Government have laid down their safeguards—an iron wall. This you must accept! And I am between the two. You accept this and call it a Federation. That is not a fair way of looking at the scheme. Therefore, I am obliged to say this scheme is not acceptable. As regards the Honourable the Home Member, I accept every word of what he said about his sincerity. I appreciate his appeal. I understand the spirit in which he spoke. I am thankful to him for all that. I know that he believes what he said: What he said was this: take it and work it. He said: "When there was no light, what happened to Moses? He was in darkness." True, but is there any light here? Is this the light? I say that Moses is still in darkness!

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: My point was that it was not we but the Congress Party who blew out the candle.

Mr M. A. Jinnah: When it suits the Home Member, what it suits the Government, they say that the Congress represents the whole of India. When it suits them, they say that the Congress is only rebels and a minority in this country. Where do I come in? Where do all these stand? (pointing to some of the Muslim members and the rest of the House). This really is not a fair argument—because of the utterances of a few of my countrymen, you are going to impose this Constitution on India and, therefore, I should accept it. Might I not turn round and say: "What about Mr Churchill, Lord Lloyd, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, Sir Reginald Craddock and the rest of them?" If I am to believe their utterances and go by them, would I not be justified to say: "I will kick the British out from India at once and there is nothing to talk about?" Do I say that? But the British Government is determined to impose on me this Constitution, which, they know perfectly well, as well as I do, is much wrose than the present Constitution. Why do they want to impose this upon us against our will? If I were to go by the utterances of one section or one party, and then decide to meet that, it is not fair deal to India. It is an excuse. When I have examined this problem in no light manner, but with full responsibility, what do I find? I believe that it means nothing but absolute sacrifice of all that British India has stood for and developed during the last 50 years, in the

matter of progress in the representative form of Government. No province was consulted as such. No consent of the princes has been obtained, whether they are willing to federate as federating units on the terms which are laid down by the princes or by the British Government. My next objection is that it is not workable. It does not really satisfy anybody and it certainly does not satisfy the minimum demand of anybody. It is not workable. Believe me, it will lead us to nothing but bitterness and ill-will, nothing but wrangles in the so-called Federal Legislature. I appeal to the princes to consider whether they are prepared to draw the chestnuts out of the fire. I appeal to the princes also—is this the responsibility which they laid down for the Centre and on which condition they were prepared to come into the Federation? The princes laid it down that, "yes, we are willing to come, provided there is a real, substantial responsibility at the Centre." Do they find that that is there? Here there are 98 per cent of the safeguards and two per cent of responsibility! Sir, I appeal to them to consider this aspect.

Now, next, what do we find about the safeguards? I am not going into the various clauses of the Statute. I will only give a short summary to the House in two sentences. Reserve Bank, Currency, Exchange—nothing doing. Railway Board—nothing doing, mortgaged to the hilt. What is left? Fiscal Autonomy Convention. (Laughter). Next, what is left? Defence, External Affairs—reserved; Finance—it is already mortgaged to the hilt, our Budget, and the little that may be here, what do we find? Special responsibility of the Governor-General! His powers as to the Budget and the estimates, his powers as to the interference in legislation, his extraordinary powers, his special responsibility. Sir, what do they leave us? What will this Legislature do? The Honourable the Home Member asked: "Are we willing to go on with this present humiliating and intolerable Constitution?" I say, I do not like this Constitution, it is humiliating, it is intolerable, but I will refer you to the words of Lord Reading. It has got more powers than the one that you are giving me, and the one that you are proposing now is more humiliating and more intolerable than the present one. But I know they will say to me, —and I think somebody said that the Leader of the Opposition is really playing the same role as Mr Winston Churchill—and that I shall be told also probably that I am playing the same role as Mr Winston Churchill because he wants to wreck the scheme and we are joining hands with Mr Churchill. You will say that to me. Yes, I know that.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: You are.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: I am doing it with my eyes open.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: You may change any moment, Churchill won't.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: I am not concerned whether the Law Member changes or whether I change. I am now concerned with expressing my opinion. This, Sir, is a grave moment. I have to express my opinion and I must express my opinion with all the responsibility, and I must express my opinion deliberately and clearly, and that is what I am concerned with. Nor am I concerned with the threat of the Law Member that the Bill be dropped. He knows nothing about it. (Laughter.) The whole of the Government of India know nothing about it. What is the good of their pretending? I am not going to make any appeal to them. As the Home Member very correctly said, neither the Government nor the people of this country have the last word; the last word is with the Parliament. I want to express my opinion for the benefit of Parliament and I want to tell them what my opinion is, and let them take the consequences. Therefore, if the Home Member said: "You are playing into the hands of Mr Churchill", my answer is: "If you want to misunderstand us, do so, if you want to misrepresent us, do so. We are not agreeing with Mr Churchill. Mr Churchill's point is that he does not want any advance at the Centre. That is not my point. My point is that I do not want this scheme at the Centre, and I call upon you to review the whole position in consultation with Indian opinion and to establish a responsible Government in my country." (Loud and prolonged Applause.) That is the difference. Well, Sir, as I say, therefore, it is no use misrepresenting us. Then, Sir, it is really a breach of a solemn announcement made by the Viceroy, then Lord Irwin, now Lord Halifax, and, as Mr Sastri said, with the change of his name he has changed his views also! (Laughter.) But, Sir, the announcement that he made was not on his own personal behalf, but on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and what was that announcement? "That His Majesty's Government will place those proposals before Parliament which will receive the largest common measure of agreement." I ask you in all your conscience: has the scheme received the largest common measure of agreement—I mean of the Indian opinion? It may have received the largest common measure of agreement of the Conservative Party, but that was not the announcement. Therefore, there is no agreement. Then we were told in our earlier stages that we were going to make India an equal partner. Sir, that word is dropped recently. Is this a partnership? Sir, the meaning of the word "partnership" and the meaning of "Cooperation" with our British friends was

this, that "we will call you a partner, but you must do as I tell you." Well, we will call it "cooperation and goodwill", provided you submit to me in everything that I say and every thing that I do. That is goodwill! That is cooperation! Sir, I from the very start felt—and I am more convinced than I was at that time—that this idea of an all-India Federation was started as a device in order to withhold responsibility at the Centre in the British Indian Constitution. We were put on the wrong track. Anybody, who had any sense must have seen or at any rate, within a short time, realised that the scheme which we were led into and had undertaken to construct was impossible really to construct. It was an imposibility almost from the start, and now there is this vicious circle: Provincial Autonomy, Federation, then responsibility at the Centre. What responsibility at the Centre? This. If you don't accept this scheme, no responsibility at the Centre, and there is nothing more to be done, and even Provincial Autonomy must go. The whole thing is to be dropped. I, therefore, say to this House that the third part of my amendment really is clear, is definite in this, that I do not accept the scheme, and I call upon His Majesty's Government to review the whole position in consultation with Indian opinion.

My friend, Mr Mody said, why not say now that these are the modifications we want? The answer I can give is this. I think the House will agree with me, because it is on record that at the First Round Table Conference we made proposals and suggestions which ended in the Sankey report. We practically rejected most of the important considerations. At the next Round Table Conference, we again made proposals and suggestions. It was worse than the first one. And what is more important is that when they say that the proposals that we made would give us an advantage, they took jolly good care to see that some safeguard is invented to prevent that being exercised. The Third Round Table Conference was still worse. Then came the Joint Parliamentary Committee. I do not challenge for a single moment that some of the Indian gentlemen who associated with the Joint Parliamentary Committee were patriots. They were men for whom I have respect, however much I may disagree with them. They tried their very best. As Mr Sastri said, they were not only incurable optimists like my Honourable friend, Mr Mody, but they were chronic and incurable cooperators and they hoped against hope and they thought that they could still appeal to the fair mind of the British people and the British statesmen and they went on in that hope. Ultimately, when all failed, they prepared a joint Memorandum.

All sections—Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsees and others—jointly said: At least give effect to these modifications. They were the moderate of moderates. What has happened to it? Where is that joint Memorandum now? It is in the waste-paper basket! Sir, I say, our self-respect demands that, helpless as we are, we must move on. We have seen this scheme, and we are not going to accept it. I want no more dilly-dallying; I want to express my definite opinion. I am threatened: "Are you going to remain in darkness for ever? Are you going to go without a Constitution of any kind for ever?" Well, these threats are not going to disturb me. These threats are not going to prevent me from expressing my views. If you like, go on with this Constitution. Therefore, Sir, I hope I have convinced the House that I am not taking merely what you may call a petulant attitude or that I am trying to force my views on anybody. I say, these are the events and I say that we must really express our opinion now unequivocally. Then, about the safeguards. It is said—I think the Honourable the Law Member said it—that these safeguards will not be used. Sir, I have got the speech of the Secretary of State for India with me, and I do not want to quote it. But he says that these safeguards are going to be used. Not only are they going to be used but he says: "Remember what is behind them. The whole service is behind them. The whole service is behind us, and ultimately he says the whole army is behind us, and these safeguards are going to be used." So, what is the good of telling me that they are not going to be used?

The next thing I wish to say is this. Sir Joseph Bhore made an appeal—a personal appeal, and I have great respect for him. I have very great respect for his opinion. He said, make the best of it. Sir, I would have understood that, but then he quoted Abraham Lincoln, a great patriot with noble sentiments. When he quoted Abraham Lincoln, it reminded me "the devil quoting the scripture." He did not finish the scripture. Is there any analogy between what Abraham Lincoln said there and the conditions and the circumstances that were in front of him and the conditions and circumstances that are in front of us? Sir, that is what I have to say so far as the third part of my amendment is concerned.

With regard to the second part of my amendment, I think Honourable Members ought to appreciate that I am not carried away by any extraneous considerations. If I had been I would have certainly agreed with my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition. I may be wrong or I may be right, but I do believe and I have no hesitation in saying so on the floor of this

House that, so far as the provincial schemes are concerned, they are undoubtedly an advance on the present, and that is why I want to make a distinction. They are an advance to this extent, and I will put it shortly. First of all, the franchise, enlargement of the electors and voters. That is the foundation-stone of any Constitution. That is an advance in my judgment. Next, all the members of the Provincial Legislatures will be elected: that is an advance. Your cabinet in the provinces will be of the elected members responsible to the Legislature and the Legislature will be responsible to the electorates. That framework of the Provincial Constitution is undoubtedly an advance. But having done that, there are certain objectionable features which I have already pointed out, such as the Second Chamber and the Governor's powers. I think the Honourable the Leader of the House was wrong when he said that I was only dealing with special responsibility. My amendment deals not only with special responsibility but it says that there are some highly objectionable features, particularly the Second Chamber and the extraordinary and special responsibility powers. I am not making any distinction—and, of course, rules with regard to the Police and the Intelligence Department. Therefore, the distinction that I make is that with regard to the Provincial scheme. I cannot say that I am so fundamentally opposed to it as to reject it. Therefore, I say, please make those modifications, and if you make those modifications:

Mr S. Satyamurti: Is there any chance?

Mr M.A. Jinnah: I am not going now by chances. I am not gambling here.

Mr S. Satyamurti: You are.

Mr. M.A. Jinnah: I am not. I am expressing my opinion. I am not here at a game of chance. Therefore, I am expressing my opinion and I am expressing it, as far as it lies in my judgment, honestly and fairly and consistent with the realities and the facts. Therefore, I say, make these modifications. I think the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, said that my amendment also means a rejection.

Mr S. Satyamurti (sitting): Even the Leader of the House says so.

Mr M. A. Jinnah: Have you got to say anything? (Mr Jinnah sat down, but there was no reply from Mr Satyamurti).

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said that my amendment also means rejection. I mean the third part of my amendment. He takes a legal view, and, to a certain extent, he is

right, and I will tell you to what extent he is right. You have made an offer, and so far as he is concerned, he says: "I do not look at it. It is so bad and I am so much disgusted with it that I do not want to look at it or any part of it.

Mr Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I have looked at it, but found it disgusting.

Mr M.A. Jinnah: He says: "I won't look at it again; I am finished with it." I, on the other hand, say: Yes, I have examined it: it is bad as far as provinces go, and the Central scheme is tolally bad, fundamentally bad: however, I do not stop there, but I make you a counter-proposal, because, I think, it is my duty not merely to indulge in a flat negative. You will say: "What do you want then?" Well Moses does not want to be in darkness for all times. Moses says to you: This is my alternative and proceed with it. Modify the Provincial scheme, drop the Central scheme, and review the whole position in consultation with Indian opinion with a view to establishing complete responsible Government in British India, Sir, I have done).

52

Government of India Act, 1935, Main Features

The Federation of India

V. (I) It shall be lawful for His Majesty, if an address in that behalf has been presented to him by each House of Parliament and if the condition hereinafter mentioned is satisfied, to declare by Proclamation that as from the day therein appointed there shall be united in a Federation under the Crown, by the name of the Federation of India:

(*a*) the Provinces hereinafter call Governors' Provinces; and

(*b*) the Indian States which have acceded or may thereafter accede to the Federation;

and in the Federation so established there shall be included the Provinces hereinafter called Chief Commissioners' Provinces.

(2) The condition referred to that States:

(*a*) the Rulers whereof will, in accordance with the provisions contained in Part II of the First Schedule to this Act, be entitled to choose not less than fifty-two members of the Council of States; and

(*b*) the aggregate population whereof, as ascertained in

accordance with the said provisions, amounts to at least one-half of the total population of the States as so ascertained,

have acceded to the Federation.

VI.—(1) A State shall be deemed to have acceded to the Federation if His Majesty has signified his acceptance of an Instrument of Accession executed by the Ruler thereof, whereby the Ruler for himself, his heirs and successors:

(*a*) declares that he accedes to the Federation as established under this Act, with the intent that His Majesty the King, the Governor-General of India, the Federal Legislature, the Federal Court and any other Federal authority established for the purposes of the Federation shall, by virtue of his Instrument of Accession, but subject always to the terms thereof, and for the purposes only of the Federation, exercise in relation to his State such functions as may be vested in them by or under this Act; and

(*b*) assumes the obligation of ensuring that due effect is given within his State to the provisions of this Act so far as they are applicable therein by virtue of his Instrument of Accession.

IX.—(1) There shall be a council of ministers, not exceeding ten in number, to aid and advise the Governor-General in the exercise of his functions, except in so far as he is by or under this Act required to exercise his functions or any of them in his discretion:

Provided that nothing in the subsection shall be construed as preventing the Governor-General from exercising his individual judgment in any case where by or under this Act he is required so to do.

XI.—(1) The functions of the Governor-General with respect to defence and ecclesiastical affairs and with respect to external affairs, except the relations between the Federation and any part of His Majesty's dominions, shall be exercised by him in his discretion, and his functions in or in relation to the tribal areas shall be similarly exercised.

(2) To assist him in the exercise of those functions the Governor-General may appoint counsellors, not exceeding three in number, whose salaries and conditions of service shall be such as may be prescribed by His Majesty in Council.

XII.—(1) In the exercise of his functions the Governor-General shall have the following special responsibilities, that is

to say:

(*a*) the prevention of any grave menace to the peace or tranquillity of India or any part thereof;

(*b*) the safeguarding of the financial stability and credit of the Federal Government;

(*c*) the safeguarding of the legitimate interests of minorities;

(*d*) the securing to, and to the dependants of, persons who are or have been members of the public service of any rights provided or preserved for them by or under this Act and the safeguarding of their legitimate interests;

(*e*) the securing in the sphere of executive action of the purposes which the provisions of chapter III of Part V of this Act are designed to secure in relation to legislation;

(*f*) the prevention of action which would subject goods of United Kingdom or Burmese origin imported into India to discriminatory or penal treatment;

(*g*) the protection of the rights of any Indian State and the rights and dignity of the Ruler thereof; and

(*h*) the securing that the due discharge of his functions with respect to matters with respect to which he is by or under this Act required to act in his discretion, or to exercise his individual judgment, is not prejudiced or impeded by any course of action taken with respect to any other matter.

(2) If and in so far as any special responsibility of the Governor-General is involved, he shall in the exercise of his functions exercise his individual judgment as to the action to be taken.

XIV.—(1) In so far as the Governor-General is by or under this Act required to act in his discretion or to exercise his individual judgment, he shall be under the general control of, and comply with such particular directions, if any, as may from time to time given to him by the Secretary of State, but the validity of anything done by the Governor-General shall not be called in question on the ground that it was done otherwise than in accordance with the provision of this section.

XVIII.—(1) There shall be a Federal Legislature which shall consist of His Majesty, represented by the Governor-General, and two Chambers, to be known respectively as the Council of State and the House of Assembly (in this Act referred to as "the

Federal Assembly").

(2) The Council of State shall consist of one hundred and fifty-six representatives of British India and not more than one hundred and four representatives of the Indian States, and the Federal Assembly shall consist of two hundred and fifty representatives of British India and not more than one hundred and twenty-five representatives of the Indian States.

(3) The said representatives shall be chosen in accordance with the provisions in that behalf contained in the First Schedule to this Act.

(4) The Council of State shall be a permanent body not subject to dissolution, but as near as may be one-third of the members thereof shall retire in every third year in accordance with the provisions in that behalf contained in the said First Schedule.

(5) Every Federal Assembly, unless sooner dissolved, shall continue for five years from the date appointed for their first meeting and no longer, and the expiration of the said period of five years shall operate as a dissolution of the Assembly.

XXXII.—(1) When a Bill has been passed by the Chambers, it shall be presented to the Governor-General, and the Governor-General shall in his discretion declare either that he assents in His Majesty's name to the Bill, or that he withholds assent therefrom, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure:

Provided that the Governor-General may in his discretion return the Bill to the Chambers with a message requesting that they will reconsider the Bill of any specified provisions thereof and, in particular, will consider the desirability of introducing any such amendments as he may recommend in his message, and the Chambers shall reconsider the Bill accordingly.

(2) A Bill reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure shall not become an Act of the Federal Legislature unless and until, within twelve months from the day on which it was presented to the Governor-General, the Governor-General makes known by public notification that His Majesty has assented thereto.

XXXIII.—(1) The Governor-General shall in respect of every financial year cause to be laid before both Chambers of the Federal Legislature a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Federation for that year, in this Part of this Act referred to as the "annual financial statement".

(2) The estimates of expenditure embodied in the annual financial statement shall show separately:

(*a*) the sums required to meet expenditure described by this Act as expenditure charged upon the revenues of the Federation; and

(*b*) the sums required to meet other expenditure proposed to be made from the revenues of the Federation;

and shall distinguish expenditure on revenue from other expenditure, and indicate the sums, if any, which are included solely because the Governor-General has directed their inclusion as being necessary for the due discharge of any of his special responsibilities.

(3) The following expenditure shall be expenditure charged on the revenues of the Federation:

(*a*) the salary and allowances of the Governor-General and other expenditure relating to his office for which provision is required to be made by Order in Council;

(*b*) debt charges for which the Federation is liable, including interest, sinking fund charges and redemption charges, and other expenditure relating to the raising of loans and the service and redemption of debt;

(*c*) the salaries and allowances of ministers, of counsellors, of the financial adviser, of the advocate-general, of chief commissioners, and of the staff of the financial adviser;

(*d*) the salaries, allowances, and pensions payable to or in respect of judges of the Federal Court, and the pensions payable to or in respect of judges of any High Court;

(*e*) expenditure for the purpose of the discharge by the Governor-General of his functions with respect to defence and ecclesiastical affairs, his functions with respect to external affairs in so far as he is by or under this Act required in the exercise thereof to act in his discretion, his functions in or in relation to tribal areas, and his functions in relation to the administration of any territory in the direction and control of which he is under this Act required to act in his discretion: provided that the sum so charged in any year in respect of expenditure on ecclesiastical affairs shall not exceed forty-two lakhs of rupees, exclusive of pension charges;

(*f*) the sums payable to His Majesty under this Act out of the revenues of the Federation in respect of the expenses incurred in discharging the functions of the Crown in its

relations with Indian States;

(*g*) any grants for purposes connected with the administration of any areas in a Province which are for the time being excluded areas;

(*h*) any sums required to satisfy any judgment, decree or award of any court or arbitral tribunal;

(*i*) any other expenditure declared by this Act or any Act of the Federal Legislature to be so charged.

(4) Any question whether any proposed expenditure falls within a class of expenditure charged on the revenues of the Federation shall be decided by the Governor-General in his discretion.

XLIII.—(1) If at any time the Governor-General is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him to take immediate action for the purpose of enabling him satisfactorily to discharge his functions in so far as he is by or under this Act required in the exercise thereof to act in his discretion or to exercise his individual judgment, he may promúlgate such ordinances as in his opinion the circumstances of the case require.

XLV.—(1) If at any time the Governor-General is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the government of the Federation cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Act, he may by Proclamation:

(*a*) declare that his functions shall to such extent as may be specified in the Proclamation be exercised by him in his discretion;

(*b*) assume to himself all or any of the powers vested in or exercisable by any Federal body or authority;

and any such Proclamation may contain such incidental and consequential provisions as may appear to him to be necessary or desirable for giving effect to the objects of the Proclamation, including provisions for suspending in whole or in part the operation of any provisions of this Act relating to any Federal body or authority:

Provided that nothing in this subsection shall authorise the Governor-General to assume to himself any of the powers vested in or exercisable by the Federal Court or to suspend, either in whole or in part, the operation of any provision of this Act relating to the Federal Court.

(4) If at any time the government of the Federation has for

a continuous period of three years been carried on under and by virtue of a Proclamation issued under this section, then, at the expiration of that period, the Proclamation shall cease to have effect and the government of the Federation shall be carried on in accordance with the other provisions of this Act, subject to any amendment thereof which Parliament may deem it necessary to make, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed as extending the power of Parliament to make amendments in this Act without affecting the accession of a State.

The Governor's Provinces

XLIV.—(1) The executive authority of a Province shall be exercised on behalf of his Majesty by the Governor, either directly or through officers subordinate to him, but nothing in this section shall prevent the Federal or the Provincial Legislature from conferring functions upon subordinate authorities, or be deemed to transfer to the Governor any functions conferred by any existing Indian law on any court, judge, or officer of any local or other authority.

(2) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the executive authority of each Province extends to the matters with respect to which the Legislature of the Province has power to make laws.

LI.—(1) The Governor's ministers shall be chosen and summoned by him, shall be sworn as members of the council, and shall hold office during his pleasure.

(2) A minister who for any period of six consecutive months is not a member of the Provincial Legislature shall at the expiration of that period cease to be a minister.

(3) The salaries of ministers shall be such as the Provincial Legislature may from time to time by Act determine, and, until the Provincial Legislature so determines, shall be determined by the Governor:

Provided that the salary of a minister shall not be varied during his term of office.

LII.—(1) In the exercise of his functions the Governor shall have the following special responsibilities, that is to say:

(*a*) the prevention of any grave menace to the peace or tranquillity of the Province or any part thereof;

(*b*) the safeguarding of the legitimate interests of minorities;

(*c*) the securing to, and to the dependants of, persons who

are or have been members of the public services of any rights provided or preserved for them by or under this Act, and the safeguarding of their legitimate interests;

(*d*) the securing in the sphere of executive action of the purposes which the provisions of chapter III of Part V of this Act are designed to secure in relation to legislation;

(*e*) the securing of the peace and good government of areas which by or under the provisions of this Part of this Act are declared to be partially excluded areas;

(*f*) the protection of the rights of any Indian State and the rights and dignity of the Ruler thereof; and the securing of the execution of orders or directions lawfully issued to him under Part VI of this Act by the Governor-General in his discretion.

(2) The Governor of the Central Provinces and Berar shall also have the special responsibility of securing that a reasonable share of the revenues of the Province is expended in or for the benefit of Berar, the Governor of any Province which includes an excluded area shall also have the special responsibility of securing that the due discharge of his functions in respect of excluded areas is not prejudiced or impeded by any course of action taken with respect to any other matter, any Governor who is discharging any functions as agent for the Governor-General shall have the special responsibility of securing that the due discharge of those functions is not prejudiced or impeded by any course of action taken with respect to any other matter, and the Governor of Sind shall also have the special responsibility of securing the proper administration of the Lloyd Barrage and Canal Scheme.

(3) If and in so far as any special responsibility of the Governor is involved, he shall, in the exercise of his functions, exercise his individual judgment as to the action to be taken.

LIV.—(1) In so far as the Governor of a Province is by or under this Act required to act in his discretion or to exercise his individual judgment, he shall be under the general control of, and comply with such particular directions, if any, as may from time to time be given to him, by the Governor-General in his discretion, but the validity of anything done by a Governor shall not be called in question on the ground that it was done otherwise than in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(2) Before giving any directions under this section, the Governor-General shall satisfy himself that nothing in the

directions requires the Governor to act in any manner inconsistent with any Instrument of Instructions issued to the Governor by His Majesty.

LX.—(1) There shall for every Province be a Provincial Legislature which shall consist of His Majesty, represented by the Governor, and—

(*a*) in the Provinces of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces, Bihar and Assam, two Chambers;

(*b*) in other provinces, one Chamber.

(2) Where there are two Chambers of a Provincial Legislature, they shall be known respectively as the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly, and where there is only one Chamber, the Chamber shall be known as the Legislative Assembly.

LXI.—(3) Every Legislative Council shall be a permanent body not subject to dissolution, but as near as may be one-third of the members thereof shall retire in every third year in accordance with the provision in that behalf made in relation to the Province under the said Fifth Schedule.

LXXV.—A Bill which has been passed by the Provincial Legislative Assembly or, in the case of a Province having a Legislative Council, has been passed by both Chambers of the Provincial Legislature, shall be presented to the Governor, and the Governor in his discretion shall declare either that he assents in His Majesty's name to the Bill, or that he withholds assent therefrom, or that he reserves the Bill for the consideration of the Governor-General:

Provided that the Governor may in his discretion return the Bill together with a message requesting that the Chamber or Chambers will reconsider the Bill or any specified provisions thereof and, in particular, will consider the desirability of introducing any such amendments as he may recommend in his message and, when a Bill is so returned, the Chamber or Chambers shall reconsider it accordingly.

LXXVII.—(1) The Governor shall in respect of every financial year cause to be laid before the Chamber or Chambers of the Legislature a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Province for that year, in this Part of this Act referred to as the "annual financial statement."

(2) The estimates of expenditure embodied in the annual financial statement shall show separately:

(*a*) the sums required to meet expenditure described by this Act as expenditure charged upon the revenues of the Province; and

(*b*) the sums required to meet other expenditure proposed to be made from the revenues of the Province,

and shall distinguish expenditure on revenue account from other expenditure, and indicate the sums, if any, which are included solely because the Governor has directed their inclusion as being necessary for the due discharge of any of his special responsibilities.

(3) The following expenditure shall be expenditure charged on the revenues of each Province:

(*a*) the salary and allowances of the Governor and other expenditure relating to his office which provision is required to be made by Order in Council;

(*b*) debt charges for which the Province is liable, including interest, sinking fund charges and redemption charges, and other expenditure relating to the raising of loans and the service and redemption of debt;

(*c*) the salaries and allowances of ministers, and of the Advocate-General;

(*d*) expenditure in respect of the salaries and allowances of judges of any High Court;

(*e*) expenditure connected with the administration of any areas which are for the time being excluded areas;

(*f*) any sums required to satisfy any judgment, decree or award of any court or arbitral tribunal;

(*g*) any other expenditure declared by this Act or any Act of the Provincial Legislature to be so charged.

(4) Any question whether any proposed expenditure falls within a class of expenditure charged on the revenues of the Province shall be decided by the Governor in his discretion.

LXXXIX.—(1) If at any time the Governor or a Province is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him to take immediate action for the purpose of enabling him satisfactorily to discharge his functions in so far as he is by or under this Act required in the exercise thereof to act in his discretion, or to exercise his individual judgment, he may promulgate such ordinances as in his opinion the circumstances of the case require.

XCIII.—(1) If at any time the Governor of a Province is

satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the government of the Province cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Act, he may by Proclamation:

(*a*) declare that his functions shall, to such extent as may be specified in the Proclamation, be exercised by him in his discretion;

(*b*) assume to himself all or any of the powers vested in or exercisable by any Provincial body or authority;

and any such Proclamation may contain such incidental and consequential provisions as may appear to him to be necessary or desirable for giving effect to the objects of the Proclamation, including provisions for suspending in whole or in part the operation of any provisions of this Act relating to any Provincial body or authority:

Provided that nothing in this subsection shall authorise the Governor to assume to himself any of the powers vested in or exercisable by a High Court, or to suspend, either in whole or in part, the operation of any provision of this Act relating to High Courts.

53

Lord Linlithgow's statement on the position of Governors under the Government of India Act, 1935, 22 June, 1937

The executive authority of a Province runs in the name of the Governor: but in the ministerial field the Governor, subject to the qualifications already mentioned, is bound to exercise that executive authority on the advice of his ministers. There are certain strictly limited and clearly defined areas in which, while here as elsewhere primary responsibility rests with ministers, the Governor remains ultimately responsible to Parliament. Over the whole of the remainder of the field ministers are solely responsible, and they are answerable only to the provincial legislature. In the discharge of the Governor's special responsibilities it is open to the Governor, and it is indeed incumbent upon him, to act otherwise than on the advice of his ministers if he considers that the action they propose will prejudice minorities or areas or other interests affected. The decision in such cases will rest with the Governor; and he will be responsible to Parliament for taking it. But the scope of such potential interference is strictly defined—and there is no foundation for any suggestion that a Governor is free, or is entitled, or would have the power, to interefere with

the day-to-day administration of a Province outside the limited range of the responsibilities specially confined to him. Before taking a decision against the advice of his ministers even within that limited range a Governor will spare no pains to make clear to his ministers the reasons which have weighed with him in thinking both that the decision is one which it is incumbent on him to take, and that it is the right one. He will put them in possession of his mind. He will listen to the arguments they address to him. He will reach his decision with full understanding of those arguments and with a mind open to conviction. In such circumstances, given the goodwill which we can I trust postulate on both sides, and for which I can on behalf of His Majesty's Government answer so far as Governors are concerned, conflicts need not in a normal situation be anticipated. . . . .

Where . . . . a really major issue is involved and ministers, even though they are not responsible for the final decision taken by a Governor, and can without any constitutional impropriety make that clear, feel that such action has raised issues of such a character, and affected their position as a parliamentary party, in such a way that they can no longer, without misunderstanding in the country, associate themselves with the Governor in the work of Administration, then it is open to ministers to resign. Or, if they do not resign and the Governor feels that his partnership with them cannot with profit to the public continue, it is open to a Governor, and indeed incumbent on him to dismiss them. But the object of Governors and, I feel confident, the object of the ministers, will at all times be to avoid such a state of things arising. The mere fact that the Government of India Act covers contingencies such as the dismissal of ministers, the breakdown of the Constitution, or the like, is not for one moment to be taken as involving an assumption that the framers of the Act, those concerned with its administration, or anyone, indeed, who is concerned for the constitutional progress and development of this great country, wishes to see those contingencies turned into realities. . . . .

54

Resolutions passed at the twenty-fourth annual session of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 12 April, 1936

1. Resolved that this important meeting of the All-India Muslim League offers its gratitude to Mr M. A. Jinnah for his valuable

services rendered in connection with the Shahidganj Mosque question, at a time when no other leader could venture to undertake the responsibility Mr Jinnah, having realised the depth of the real feelings of the youths of the Punjab, went to Lahore and made the Government of the Punjab to accept the demands of the Mussalmans and thus gave a great impetus to the Mussalmans of the Punjab in general and the youths of the province in particular.

2. Resolved that the All-India Muslim League enters its emphatic protest against forcing the Constitution as embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935, upon the people of India, against their will and in spite of their repeated disapproval and dissent, expressed by various parties and bodies in the country.

The League considers that having regard to the conditions prevailing at present in the country the Provincial scheme of the Constitution be utilised for what it is worth in spite of the most objectionable features contained therein, which render the real control and responsibility of the Ministry and the Legislature over the entire field of the Government and the administration nugatory.

The League is clearly of the opinion that the All-India Federal Scheme of the Central Government embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935, is fundamentally bad. It is most reactionary retrograde, injurious and fatal to the vital interests of British India *vis-a-vis* the Indian States, and it is calculated to thwart and delay indefinitely the realization of India's most cherished goal of complete responsible government and is totally unacceptable.

The League considers that the British Parliament should still take the earliest opportunity to review the whole situation afresh regarding the Central Scheme before it is inaugurated; or else the League feels convinced that it would not bring peace and contentment to the people, but on the contrary it will lead to disaster if forced upon the people and persisted in as it is entirely unworkable in interest of India and her people.

3. Whereas the Parliamentary system of Government which is being introduced in this country with the inauguration of the new Constitution, presupposes the formation of parties with a well-defined policy and programme which facilitate the education of the electorate, and cooperation between groups with approximate aims and ideals and ensures the working of the constitution to the best advantage; and whereas in order to strengthen the

solidarity of the Muslim community and to secure for the Muslims their proper and effective share in the provincial governments, it is essential that the Muslims should organize themselves as one party, with an advanced and progressive programme, it is hereby resolved that the All-India Muslim League do take steps to contest the approaching provincial elections, and for this purpose appoint Mr M. A. Jinnah to form a Central Election Board under his presidentship, consisting of not less than 35 members, with powers to constitute and affiliate provincial election boards in various provinces, having regard to the condition of each province, and devise ways and means for carrying out the aforesaid object.

55

Mr M. A. Jinnah's statement on personnel of the Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board, 1936

In accordance with the Resolution passed by the All-India Muslim League on the 12th of April, 1936, at Bombay, I was directed to form a Central Parliamentary Board with powers to constitute or affiliate Provincial Parliamentary Boards of various Provinces to contest the approaching elections on the ticket of the All-India Muslim League. I have taken all the trouble that was possible in doing my utmost to see that the Central Board is made as truly representative of the Mussalmans of India as possible.

For this purpose I had long consultations in Delhi with the Members of the Council of the All-India Muslim League and of the various representatives of different Provinces whom I had invited for that purpose in view on the 26th, 27th and 28th of April, 1936; and further, after four days of my stay in Punjab, I had the opportunity of discussing the matter with the various leaders of Punjab and after careful consideration I wish to announce the following names as the Members of the Central Parliamentary Board :

BENGAL

1. Nawab of Dacca.
2. Mr Fazlul Haq.
3. Khan Bahadur Abdul Momin.
4. Maulana Akram Khan.
5. Mr Shahid Suharawardy.

7. Mr M.A.H. Ispahani.
8. Mr Majibur Rahman.

MADRAS

1. Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadur.
2. Mr Abdul Hamid Khan, Mayor, Madras Municipality.
3. Mr Jamal Mohammad.
4. Mr B. Poker.

UNITED PROVINCES

1. Nawab Mohammad Ismail Khan.
2. Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan.
3. Raja Saheb of Mahmoodabad.
4. Raja of Salimpore.
5. Maulana Shaukat Ali.
6. Chaudhri Khaliquzzaman.
7. Maulana Husain Ahmad.

BIHAR

1. Mr Qazi Ahmed Hossain.
2. Maulana Sajjad Phulwari Sharif.
3. Shah Masud Ahmad, Ex. M.L.A.
4. Mr A. Hafiz, Advocate.

CENTRAL PROVINCES

1. Syed Abdur Rauf Shah, B.A., LL.B.
2. Mr Yusuf Shariff, Bar-at-Law.

ASSAM

1. Mr Abdul Matin Chaudhri.
2. Mr M.A. Razzaque.

SIND

1. Sheikh Abdul Majid.
2. Hakim Fateh Mohamed Sharwani.
3. Moulvi Mohammed Sidiq Khadda.
4. Mohammed Hashim Gazdar.

N.-W. Frontier Province

1. Malik Pir Bux, M.L.C.

2. Maulana Allah Bux Yusufi.
3. Maulana Abdul Rahim Ghaznavi.
4. Malik Khuda Bakhsh, B.A., LL.B., M.L.C.

PUNJAB

1. Sir Mohammad Iqbal.
2. Maulana Mohammad Ishaq Khan Mansehravi.
3. Ghazi Abdur Rehman, B.A.
4. Mian Abdul Aziz.
5. Syed Zain-ul-Abedin.
6. Maulana Abdul Qadir Kasuri.
7. The Hon'ble Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan.
8. Sheikh Hisam-ud-Din.
9. Chaudhri Afzal Haq, M.L.C.
10. Ch. Abdul Aziz of Begowal.
11. Khawaja Ghulam Hussain, Pleader.

DELHI

1. Maulana Ahmed Saeed.
2. Mufti Kifaetullah.

BOMBAY

1. Sir Suleman Cassim Mitha.
2. Mr R.M. Chinoy.
3. Mr Abubacker Beg Mohammad.
4. Mr Ismail Chandhrigar.
5. Thakore Sahib of Kerwada, M.L.C.
6. Khan Bahadur Salahuddin.

If I have omitted any name or names, and I am fully conscious that is possible, I regret such omission and hope that considering the great task and the obligation that was imposed upon me to constitute this Board, the Mussalmans will loyally abide by my selection, and, of course, the Board will have to add to its number and, therefore, any omission or oversight on my part can be rectified by the Board itself by electing any additional person or persons as Members of the Central Board. I may here state that I have not been able to get proper information with regard to the Province of Orissa, and, therefore, I have not been able to select the Members of that province for the Central Board, but this can be also done by the Central Board.

56

Rules, Policy and Programme of the Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board

Rules of the Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board

1. The Board shall elect its own President, Secretary and Treasurer.

2. The Board may appoint a Working Committee and may delegate to the Working Committee such powers and functions as are deemed necessary.

3. The Board shall have power to raise funds and administer and disburse the same for propaganda and publicity and other incidental expenses and keep a proper account.

4. The Board may appoint Sub-Committees to further objects for which the Board has been constituted.

5. The President shall preside over all the meetings of the Board and the Working Committee.

6. In the absence of the President the Members present shall elect one of themselves to the Chair.

7. All questions shall be decided by a majority of votes the President having a second casting vote.

8. At least 15 days' notice shall be given for holding the ordinary meeting of the Board which shall be convened by the Secretary with the previous consent of the President. In case of emergency the President may call the meeting at shorter notice.

9. Every candidate offering to contest the election on behalf of any Provincial Board shall signify his readiness to abide by the decisions of the Provincial Board and also shall sign a pledge accepting the programme adopted by the Central and the Provincial Board, and provided further that such candidate shall stand by the Muslim League pledge and no other party pledge.

10. The Provincial Boards shall be autonomous within their respective Provinces and shall select candidates and run elections subject to the acceptance of the general policy of the Central Board and affiliation to the same.

11. The meetings of the Board shall be held at such place and such time as the President may direct.

12. Nine members shall form a quorum in the Board meeting. If a meeting is adjourned for want of quorum no quorum will be necessary for the adjourned meeting.

13. Members of the Central Board from respective Provinces shall form Election Boards in their own Provinces subject to recognition and affiliation by the Central Board and if they fail to do so within a reasonable time the Central Board or the Working Committee if so authorised shall constitute or affiliate any Provincial Board.

14. The Provincial Boards shall supply the list of candidates adopted by them at least two months before the polling days.

15. The Provincial Boards in each Province will be at liberty to decide by a majority of two-thirds to coöperate with any political group or groups provided their aims and objects and ideals are approximately the same as those of the Muslim League Central and Provincial Boards.

16. The Central Board shall frame at its first meeting Manifesto defining general policy and programme.

17. The Central Board will have powers to suspend or disaffiliate any Provincial Board at any time.

18. No alteration, modification, or addition shall be made in the rules mentioned hereinbefore except by a majority of two-thirds of members present.

Policy and Programme

The advent and the announcement of the Minto-Morley Reforms brought home to the leaders of the Mussalmans the necessity of starting a Muslim Political Organization and thus was founded the All-India Muslim League at Dacca in December, 1906.

The League adopted its creed an ideal definitely in December, 1912 and altered its constitution having for its aims and objects:

(1) Full responsible government for India with adequate and effective safeguards for Mussalmans.

(2) To protect and advance the political and religious and other rights and interests of the Indian Mussalmans.

(3) To promote friendship and union between the Mussalmans and other communities of India.

(4) To maintain and strengthen brotherly relations between the Mussalmans of India and those of other countries.

The League has been faithfully and loyally acting in accordance with these fundamental principles ever since. During the period of the existence of the Minto Morley constitution, it continued from time to time and represented and watched the true feelings and opinions of the Mussalmans. As time went on, the cooperation and help of the prominent leaders of India and particularly that great man, the Maharaja of Mahmoodabad, whose selfless devotion, patriotic fervour and single mindedness of purpose gave the League such a strength and power and support that it reached the zenith of its ascendancy accomplished what is one of the greatest beacon lights in the constitutional history of India, the Lucknow Pact, which is known as "League-Congress Pact" in 1916. This Pact will go down in the Indian history as a land-mark in the political evolution of the country as a signal proof of identity of purpose and earnestness and co-operation between the two great sections of the people of India, in the task of attainment of responsible government. But the pact was not the last word on the question of adjustment of political differences between Hindus and Mussalmans. Nor was it ever intended or could be considered in the new circumstances that arose and developed since then. The national demand for complete responsible government after the Montagu Chelmsford Reforms became more and more insistent and from 1920 onward the Mussalmans stood shoulder to shoulder with the sister communities and did not lag behind in their sacrifice and their patriotic cooperation with the Hindus. But as a minority they maintain the principle that their position in any future political constitutional structure should be protected and safeguarded. Here it might be stated that at first sight it may appear to an amateur politician that such a demand savours of communalism, but, in reality, to those who understand the political and constitutional histories of the world, it must be evident that it is not only natural but it is essential for securing a stable national government by ensuring whole-hearted and will cooperation of the minorities who are made to feel that they can rely upon the majority with the complete sense of confidence are security. In the various steps that followed, the deliberations and collaborations that took place, the League has always stood for full responsible government for India and unflinchingly today stands for the same ideal. It deplores that as a result of the Round Table Conference, the British Parliament has forced upon the people of India a constitution embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935. Its attitude towards the constitution is defined by its resolution passed at the sessions of the All-India Muslim League

on the 11th and 12th of April, 1936 to the following effect:

While it accepts the communal award till a substitute is agreed upon between the communities concerned, it emphatically protests against the constitution embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, being forced upon the people of India against their will and in spite of their repeated disapproval and dissent expressed by various parties and bodies in the country.

The League considers that, having regard to the conditions prevailing at present in the country, the provincial scheme of the Constitution be utilised for what it is worth in spite of the most objectionable features contained therein, which render the real control and responsibility of the ministry and the Legislature over the entire field of Government and the Administration nugatory.

The League is clearly of the opinion that the All-India Federal Scheme of the Central Government, embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935, is fundamentally bad, it is most reactionary, retrograde, injurious and fatal to the vital interests of British India *vis-a-vis* the Indian States, and it is calculated to thwart and delay indefinitely the realisation of India's most cherished goal of complete responsible government is totally unacceptable.

The League considers that the British Parliament should still take the earliest opportunity to review the whole situation afresh regarding the Central scheme before it is inaugurated; or else the League feels convinced that the present scheme will not bring peace and contentment to the people, but on the contrary it will lead to disaster if forced upon and persisted and as it is entirely unworkable in the interests of India and her people.

But as it will be observed that as the provincial scheme, embodied in the Government of India Act, is going to be enforced in the course of the next year, the League decided that having regard to the conditions prevailing at present in the country, the provincial scheme of the constitution be utilised for what it is worth. In view of this decision of the League, the League further decided that a Central Election Board should be formed with power to constitute and affiliate Provincial Election Boards in various provinces and passed a resolution to this effect.

In pursuance of that resolution the Central Board has been now formed and the policy and the programme of the Central Board has to be defined.

The inauguration of the Montagu Chelmsford scheme of constitution and working, thereof, has developed and brought

forth various forces and it appears that such power as was available under that scheme has been captured in the various provinces by reactionary conservative element in combination with a coterie of men whose sole aim and object is to secure offices and places for themselves wherever and whenever available. This has suited the Government and these two classes haye received every encouragement and support, with the result that they have not only been a hindrance and an obstacle in the way of the independent and progressive intelligentsia but the people generally have been exploited. Thus was created a double domination of the reactionary forces and the imperialistic power. Our aim is that this domination must cease.

The present political situation in the country has been described aptly by the President of the last session of the All-India Muslim League in the following words:

"New problems have arisen today. It is not only a question of educating the middle class of the Muslims in India on Western lines and providing them with jobs; it is not only a question of infusing in them the ideals of Victorian liberalism, on the contrary the present conditions compel us to go much deeper into the problems of entire social regeneration of seventy millions of Muslims; of extricating them from the terrible poverty, degraduation and backwardness into which they have fallen and giving them at least the rudiments of a civilised existence and making them free citizens of a free land. We must realize, as people of other countries have realised, that a change is necessary and that unless such a change is soon made the whole of this social structure must come down with a crash, which will involve the extinction of not only the educated section of our people but also of all privileged classes whether they hold privileges by reason of caste, land or money. The foundations of the super-structure in which we are living today were laid centuries ago and it is but natural that those foundations ceased to be stable now. It is the duty, if it is not only an obligation created by motives of self interest, of all of us, the educated classes, the capitalists, and the land-holders, to combine together to lay the fouudations of a new structure. Of course, in order that this effort must fructify sacrifices will have to be made on the part of all. Let me tell you that the building of such a social edifice will be more glorious, more humane and more just than the building of an empire."

But at the same time we must make it clear that the League is opposed to any movement that aims at expropriation of private property.

The main principles on which we expect our representatives in the various legislatures to work will be:

1. That the present Provincial Constitution and the proposed Central Constitution should be replaced immediately by democratic full Self-Government.
2. And that in the meantime the representatives of the Muslim League in the various Legislatures will utilise the Legislatures in order to extract the maximum benefit out of the constitution for the uplift of the people in various spheres of national life.

The Muslim League Party must be formed as a corollary so long as separate electorates exist but they would be free to co-operate with any group or groups whose aims and ideals are approximately the same as those of the All-India Muslim League. The League appeals to Mussalmans that they should not permit themselves to be exploited on economic or any other ground which will break up the solidarity of the community.

The Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board adopts the following programme for ensuing elections:

1. To protect the religious rights of the Mussalmans. In all matters of purely religious character, due weight shall be given to the opinions of Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind and the Mujtahids.
2. To make every effort to secure the repeal of all repressive laws.
3. To resist all measures which are detrimental to the interests of India, which encroach upon the fundamental liberties of the people and lead to economic exploitation of the country.
4. To reduce heavy cost of administrative machinery, central and provincial, and allocate substantial funds for nation-building departments.
5. To nationalize Indian Army and reduce the military expenditure.
6. To encourage development of Industries, including cottage industries.
7. To regulate currency, exchange and prices in the interest of economic development of the country.
8. To stand for the social, educational and economic uplift of the rural population.
9. To sponsor measures for the relief of agricultural

indebtedness.

10. To make elementary education free and compulsory.
11. To protect and promote Urdu language and script.
12. To devise measures for the amelioration of the general conditions of Muslims.
13. To take steps to reduce the heavy burden of taxation.
14. To create a healthy public opinion and general political consciousness throughout the country.

57

Letters of Allama Iqbal to Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah

Lahore,
23rd May, 1936.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

Thank you so much for your letter which I received a moment ago. I am glad to see that your work is progressing. I do hope that the Punjab parties—specially the Ahrar and the Ittihad Millat—will eventually, after some bickering join you. A very enthusiastic and active member of the Ittihad told me so a few days ago. About Mr Zafar Ali Khan the Ittihad people do not themselves feel sure. However, there is plenty of time yet, and we shall soon see how the electorate generally feels about the Ittihad sending their men to the Assembly.

Hoping you are well, and looking forward to meeting you.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Lahore,
9th June, 1936.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

I am sending you my draft. Also a cutting from the Eastern Times of yesterday. This is a letter from an intelligent pleader of Gurdaspur.

I hope the statement issued by the Board will fully argue the whole scheme and will meet all the objections so far advanced against it. It must frankly state the present position of the Indian Muslims as regards both the Government and the Hindus. It must warn the Muslims of India that unless the present scheme is adopted the Muslims will lose all that they have gained during

the last 15 years and will seriously harm, and in fact, shatter their own solidarity with their own hands.

Yours etc.
Muhammad Iqbal.

P.S.

Will feel much obliged if you send the statement to me before it is sent to the press.

Another point which should be brought out in the statement is as follows:

1. Indirect election to the Central Assembly has made it absolutely essential that Muslim representatives returned to the Provincial Assemblies should be bound by an All-India Muslim policy and programme so that they should return to the Central Assembly only those Muslims who would be pledged to support the specific Muslim questions connected with the Central subjects and arising out of their position as the second great nation of India. Those who are now for Provincial policies and programmes were themselves instrumental in getting indirect elections for the Central Assembly introduced into the constitution, obviously because this suited a foreign Government. Now when the community wants to make the best use of this misfortune (i.e. indirect elections) by proposing an All-India scheme of elections (e.g., League scheme) to be adhered to by the Provincial candidates, the same men, again at the instance of a foreign Government, have come out to defeat the community in their effort to retain its solidarity as a Nation.

2. Question of Wakf Law arising out of Shahidganj, culture, language, mosques and personal law.

Lahore,
25th June, 1936.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

Sir Sikandar Hayat left Lahore a day or two ago. I think he will meet you at Bombay and have a talk with you about certain matters of importance. Daultana saw me yesterday evening. He tells me that the Muslim members of the Unionist Party are prepared to make the following declaration:

"That in all matters specific to the Muslim community as an all-India minority they will be bound by the decision of the League and will never make any pact with any non-Muslim group in the Provincial Assembly."

Provided the League (Provincial) makes the following declaration:

"That those returned to the Provincial Assembly on the League ticket will cooperate with that party or group which has the largest number of Muslims."

Please let me know at your earliest convenience what you think of this proposal. Also let me know the result of your talk with Sir Sikandar Hayat. If you succeed in convincing him he may come to our side.

Hoping you are well . . . .

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Mayo Road, Lahore,
23rd August, 1936.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

I hope my letter reached you all right. There is some talk of an understanding between the Punjab Parliamentary Board and the Unionist Party. I should like you to let me know what you think of such a compromise and to suggest conditions for the same. I read in the papers that you have brought about a compromise between the Bengal Proja Party and the Parliamentary Board. I should like to know the terms and the conditions. Since the Proja Party is non-communal like the Unionist, your compromise in Bengal may be helpful to you.

Hoping you are well . . . .

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Lahore,
20th March, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

I suppose you have read Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's address to the All-India National Convention and that you fully realise the policy underlying it in so far as Indian Muslims are concerned. I believe you are also aware that the new constitution has at least brought a unique opportunity to Indian Muslims for self-organization in view of the future political developments both in India and Muslim Asia. While we are ready to cooperate with other progressive parties in the country, we must not ignore the fact that the whole future of Islam as a moral and political force

in Asia rests very largely on a complete organization of Indian Muslims. I, therefore, suggest that an effective reply should be given to the All-India National Convention. You should immediately hold an All-India Muslim Convention in Delhi to which you should invite members of the new Provincial Assemblies as well as other prominent Muslim leaders. To this convention you must re-state as clearly and as strongly as possible the political objective of the Indian Muslims as a distinct political unit in the country. It is absolutely necessary to tell the world both inside and outside India that the economic problem is not the only problem in the country. From the Muslim point of view the cultural problem is of much greater consequence to most Indian Muslims. At any rate it is not less important than the economic problem. If you could hold this Convention, it would test the credentials of those Muslim Legislators who have formed parties contrary to the aims and aspirations of Indian Muslims. It would further make it clear to the Hindus that no political device, however subtle, can make the Indian Muslim lose sight of his cultural entity. I am coming to Delhi in a few days' time and hope to have a talk with you on this important matter. I shall be staying in the Afghan Consulate. If you could spare a few moments, we should meet there. Please drop a line in reply to this letter as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

P.S.

Please excuse me. I have got this letter written by a friend as my eye-sight is getting bad.

Lahore,
22nd April, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

I do not know whether my letter which I posted to you about two weeks ago ever reached you. I posted it to your address at New Delhi, and when I went to Delhi later, I discovered that you had already left Delhi. In that letter I proposed that we should hold immediately an All-India Muslim Convention, say at Delhi, and once more re-state the policy of Indian Muslims both to the Government and to the Hindus.

As the situation is becoming grave and the Muslim feeling in the Punjab is rapidly becoming pro-Congress for reasons which it is unnecessary to detail, I would request you to consider and decide the matter as early as possible. The session of the All-India Muslim League is postponed till August, and the situation demands an early re-statement of the Muslim policy. If the

Convention is preceded by a tour of prominent Muslim leaders, the meeting of the Convention is sure to be a great success. Please drop a line in reply to this letter as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Lahore,
28th May, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

Thank you so much for your letter which reached me in due course. I am glad to hear that you will bear in mind what I wrote to you about the changes in the constitution and programme of the League. I have no doubt that you fully realise the gravity of the situation as far as Muslim India is concerned. The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a polittcal organization which gives no promise of improving the lot of the average Muslims cannot attract our masses.

Under the new constitution the higher posts go to the sons of upper classes; the smaller ones go to the friends or relatives of the ministers. In other matters too our political institutions have never thought of improving the lot of Muslims generally. The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him. But it is bound to come. The atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question, therefore, is: how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends on the League's activity to solve this question. If the League can give no such promises, I am sure, the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before. Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of the Law of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law, I have come to the conclusion that if this system of Law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the Shariat of Islam is impossible in this country

without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact has been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots. I fear that in certain parts of the country, e.g. N.-W. India, Palestine may be repeated. Also the insertion of Jawaharlal's socialism into the body-politic of Hinduism is likely to cause much bloodshed among the Hindus themselves. The issue between social democracy and Brahmanism is not dissimilar to the one between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Whether the fate of socialism will be the same as the fate of Buddhism in India, I cannot say. But it is clear to my mind that if Hinduism accepts social democracy it must necessarily cease to be Hinduism. For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam. The modern problems, therefore, are far more easy to solve for the Muslims than the Hindus. But as I have said above, in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems, it is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived? Perhaps this is the best reply you can give to the atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru.

Anyhow, I have given you my own thoughts in the hope that you will give them serious consideration either in your address or in the discussions of the coming session of the League. Muslim India hopes that at this serious juncture your genius will discover some way out of present difficulties.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

P.S.

On the subject-matter of this letter I intended to write to you a long and open letter in the Press. But on further consideration I felt that the present moment was not suitable for such a step.

Lahore,
21st June, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

Thank you so much for your letter which I received yesterday. I know you are a busy man, but I do hope you won't mind my writing to you so often, as you are the only Muslim in India

today to whom the community has a right to look up for safe guidance through the storm which is coming to North-West India, and perhaps to the whole of India. I tell you that we are actually living in a state of civil war which, but for the police and military, would become universal in no time. During the last few months there has been a series of Hindu-Muslim riots in India. In North-West India alone there have been at least three riots during the last three months and at least four cases of vilification of the Prophet by Hindus and Sikhs. In each of these four cases, the vilifer has been murdered. There have also been cases of burning of the Quran in Sind. I have carefully studied the whole situation and believed that the real cause of these events is neither religious nor economic. It is purely political, i.e. the desire of the Sikhs and Hindus to intimidate Muslims even in the Muslim majority provinces. And the new constitution is such that even in the Muslim majority provinces, the Muslims are made entirely dependent on non-Muslims. The result is that the Muslim Ministry can take no proper action and are even driven to do injustice to Muslims partly to please those on whom they depend, and partly to show that they are absolutely impartial. Thus it is clear that we have our specific reasons to reject this constitution. It seems to me that the new constitution is devised only to placate the Hindus. In the Hindu majority provinces, the Hindus have of course absolute majorities, and can ignore Muslims altogether. In Muslim majority provinces, the Muslims are made entirely dependent on Hindus. I have no doubt in my mind that this constitution is calculated to do infinite harm to the Indian Muslims. Apart from this it is no solution of the economic problem which is so acute among Muslims.

The only thing that the communal award grants to Muslims is the recognition to their political existence in India. But such a recognition granted to a people whom this constitution does not and cannot help in solving their problem of poverty can be of no value to them. The Congress President has denied the political existence of Muslims in no unmistakable terms. The other Hindu political body, i.e., the Mahasabha, whom I regard as the real representative of the masses of the Hindus, has declared more than once that a united Hindu-Muslim nation is impossible in India. In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a redistribution of the country on the lines of racial, religious and linguistic affinities. Many British statesmen also realise this, and the Hindu-Muslim riots which are rapidly coming in the wake of this constitution are sure further to open their eyes to the real situation in the country. I remember Lord

Lothian told me before I left England that my scheme was the only possible solution of the troubles of India, but that it would take 25 years to come. Some Muslims in the Punjab are already suggesting the holding of a North-West Indian Muslim Conference, and the idea is rapidly spreading. I agree with you, however, that our community is not yet sufficiently organised and disciplined and perhaps the time for holding such a conference is not yet ripe. But I feel that it would be highly advisable for you to indicate in your address at least the line of action that the Muslims of North-West India would be finally driven to take.

To my mind the new constitution with its idea of a single Indian federation is completely hopeless. A separate federation of Muslim provinces, reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are?

Personally I think that the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought at present to ignore Muslim minority provinces. This is the best course to adopt in the interests of both Muslim majority and minority provinces. It will, therefore, be better to hold the coming session of the League in the Punjab, and not in a Muslim minority province. The month of August is bad in Lahore. I think you should seriously consider the advisability of holding the coming session at Lahore in middle of October when the weather is quite good in Lahore. The interest in the All-India Muslim League is rapidly growing in the Punjab and the holding of the coming session in Lahore is likely to give a fresh political awakening to the Punjab Muslims.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Lahore,
11th August, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

Events have made it abundantly clear that the League ought to concentrate all its activities on the North-West Indian Mussalmans. The League office of Delhi informed Mr Ghulam Rasool that the dates of the sessions of the Muslim League have not been fixed as yet.

This being so, I fear it will not be possible to hold the sessions in August and September. I, therefore, repeat my request that the League sessions may be held in Lahore in the middle or end of October. The enthusiasm for the League is rapidly increasing in the Punjab, and I have no doubt that the holding of the session in Lahore will be a turning point in the history of the League and an important step towards mass contact. Please drop a line in reply.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal,

Lahore,
7th October, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

A strong contingent from the Punjab is expected to attend the Lucknow Session of the League. The Unionist Muslims are also making preparations to attend under the leadership of Sir Sikandar Hayat. We are living in difficult times and the Indian Muslims expect that your address will give them the clearest possible lead in all matters relating to the future of the community. I suggest that the League may state or re-state its policy relating to the communal award in the shape of a suitable resolution. In the Punjab, and I hear also in Sind, attempts are being made by misguided Muslims themselves to alter it in the interest of the Hindus. Such men fondly believe that by pleasing the Hindus they will be able to retain their power. I personally believe that since the British Government wants to humour the Hindus who would welcome the upsetter of the communal award they (the British Government) are trying to get it upset through their Muslim agents.

I shall prepare a list of 28 persons for the vacancies in the League Council. Mr Ghulam Rasool will show you this list. I do hope that this choice will be carefully made. Our men will leave Lahore on the 13th.

The Palestine question is very much agitating the minds of the Muslims. We have a very fine opportunity for mass contact for the purposes of the League. I have no doubt that the League will pass a strong resolution on this question and also by holding a private conference of the leaders decide on some sort of a positive action in which masses may share in large numbers. This will at once popularise the League and may help the Palestine Arabs. Personally I would not mind going to jail on an issue

which affects both Islam and India. The formation of a Western base on the very gates of the East is a menace to both.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

P.S.

The League should resolve that no province should come to any understanding with other communities regarding the communal award. This is an All-India question and must be settled by the League alone. Perhaps you may go further and say that the present atmosphere is not at all suitable for any communal understanding.

Lahore,
30th October, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

I suppose you have already read the resolution passed by the A.I.C.C. Your move in time has saved the situation, and we are all waiting for your observation on the Congress resolution. The Tribune of Lahore has already criticised it and I believe Hindu opinion will generally be opposed to it. However, it should not act as an opiate as far as Muslims are concerned. We must carry the work of organization more vigorously than ever and should not rest till Muslim Governments are established in the five provinces and reforms are granted to Baluchistan.

The rumour is that part of the Unionist Party does not mean to sign the League creed. So far Sir Sikandar and his party have not signed it and I heard this morning that they would wait till the next sessions of the League. The idea, as one of themselves told me, is to slacken the activities of the Provincial League. However, I shall place you in possession of all the fact in a few days time and then ask your opinion as to how we should proceed. I do hope that before the Lahore Session you would be able to tour in the Punjab for at least two weeks.

Your sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Lahore,
1st November, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan with some of the members of his party saw me yesterday and we had a long talk about the dif-

ferences between the League and the Unionist Party. Statements have been issued to the press by both sides, each side putting its own interpretation on the terms of Jinnah-Sikandar agreement. This has caused much misunderstanding. As I wrote to you before, I will put you in possession of all those statements in a few days' time. For the present I request you to kindly send me as early as possible a copy of the agreement which was signed by Sir Sikandar and which I am told is in your possession. I further want to ask you whether you agreed to the Provincial Parliamentary Board being controlled by the Unionist Party. Sir Sikandar tells me that you agreed to this and, therefore, he claims that the Unionist Party must have their majority in the Board. This, as far as I know, does not appear in the Jinnah-Sikandar agreement.

Please reply to this letter as early as possible. Our men are touring in the country and forming Leagues in various places. Last night we had a very successful meeting in Lahore. Others will follow.

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

Lahore,
10th November, 1937.

My dear Mr Jinnah,

After having several talks with Sir Sikandar and his friends I am now definitely of the opinion that Sir Sikandar wants nothing less than the complete control of the League and the Provincial Parliamentary Board. In your pact with him it is mentioned that the Parliamentary Board will be reconstituted and that the Unionists will have majority in the Board. Sir Sikandar tells me that you agreed to their majority in the Board. I wrote to you some time ago to enquire whether you did agree to the Unionist majority in the Board. So far I have not heard from you. I personally see no harm in giving him the majority that he wants but he goes beyond the pact when he wants a complete change in the office-holders of the League, especially the Secretary who has done so much for the League. He also wishes that the finances of the League should be controlled by his men. All this to my mind amounts to capturing the League and then killing it. Knowing the opinion of the province as I do, I cannot take the responsibility of handing over the League to Sir Sikandar and his friends. The pact has already damaged the prestige of the League in this province; and the tactics of the Unionists may damage it still further. They have not so far signed the creed of

the League, and I understand do not mean to. The session of the League in Lahore they want in April instead of February. My impression is that they want to gain time for their own Zamindara League to function in the province. Perhaps you know that on his return from Lucknow Sir Sikandar constituted a Zamindara League whose branches are now being made in the province. In these circumstances please let me know what we should do. Kindly wire your view if possible. If this is not possible, write a detailed letter as early as possible,

Yours sincerely,
Muhammad Iqbal.

58

Allama Iqbal's Statement on the attitude of Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conference, 6 December, 1933

I have never had the pleasure of meeting Pandit Jawahar Lal, though I have always admired his sincerity and outspokeness. His latest statement in reply to his Mahasabhite critics has a ring of sincerity which is rare in the pronouncements of present-day politicians in India. It seems, however, that he is not in full possession of the facts regarding the behaviour of Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conferences held in London during the past three years.

He has been led to believe that Mr Gandhi offered personally to accept all of the Muslim demands on condition that Muslims assured him of their full support in the political struggle for freedom and that reactionaryism rather than communalism prevented Muslims from accepting this condition. This is a perfectly wrong statement of what happened in London.

Pandit Jawahar Lal has described His Highness the Agha Khan as the greatest inspirer of political reactionaryism among Muslims. The truth, however, is that it was the Agha Khan himself who assured Mr Gandhi in the presence of several Indian delegates, including myself, that if the Hindus or the Congress agreed to Muslim demands, the entire Muslim community would be ready to serve as his (Mr Gandhi's) camp-followers in the political struggle.

Mr Gandhi weighed the Agha Khan's words and his offer to accept Muslim demands came later and was hedged round with conditions. The first condition was that Mr Gandhi would accept

the Muslim demands in his personal capacity and would try to secure, but not guarantee, the acceptance of his position by the Congress. I asked him to wire to the Congress Executive and secure its consent to his offer. He said he knew that the Congress would not make him their plenipotentiary on the question.

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru can easily refer to Mrs Sarojini Naidu, who sat near me at the time as to her observations which she shared with me on Mr Gandhi's attitude. Mr Gandhi was then asked to secure at least the Hindu and Sikh delegates' consent to his offer. He did make something like an attempt to do so but failed and privately expressed his disappointment with their attitdue.

Mr Gandhi's second most unrighteous condition was that Muslims should not support the special claims of Untouchables, particularly their claim to special representation. It was pointed out to him that it did not lie in the mouth of Muslims to oppose those very claims on the part of the Untouchables which they were advancing for themselves and that if Mr Gandhi could arrive at a mutual understanding with the Untouchables, the Muslims would certainly not stand in their way. Mr Gandhi, however, insisted on the condition. I should like to know how far Pandit Jawahar Lal with his well-known socialist views and sympathise with such an inhuman condition.

This is the inner history of the negotiations between Mr Gandhi and Muslim delegates. I would leave it to Pandit Jawahar Lal to judge whether the alleged political reactionaryism among Muslim delegates or the narrow political outlook of others was responsible for the result of negotiations.

The offer which His Highness the Agha made to Mr Gandhi two years ago still holds good. If under Pandit Nehru's leadership the Hindus or the Congress agree to the safeguards which Muslims believe to be necessary for their protection as an all-India minority, the Muslims are still ready to serve, in the Agha Khan's words, as camp-followers of the majority in the country's political struggle. If, however, he is unable to accept this offer let him at least not accuse Muslims of political reactionaryism but leave those who understand the motive and purposes of Hindu communalism to draw the conclusion that he is in essential agreement with the Mahasabha in the latter's campaign against the Communal Award.

Another accusation which Panidt Jawahar Lal brings against Muslims is that some of them are definitely antinational. If by "nationalism" he means a fusion of the communities in a

biological sense, I should personally plead guilty to the charge of antinationalism. The building up of nation in this sense is, in my opinion, neither possible nor perhaps desirable in the peculiar circumstances of India. In this sense perhaps the greatest anti-national leader in India of today is Mr Gandhi who has made it a life-mission to prevent the fusion of Untouchables with other communities and to retain them in the fold of Hinduism without any real fusion even between them and the caste Hindus. As far as I can judge it, his message to the Uutouchables amounts to this: "Do not leave Hinduism. Remain in it without being of it."

A man who opposes nationalism in the sense of a fusion of the communities is, however, not necessarily anti-national. It is obvious that there are interests common to the various communities of India. In so far as these interests are concerned an understanding among the communities is possible according to my belief, is bound to come. The present situation is only a necessary stage in the country's political evolution. A united India will have to be built on the foundation of concrete facts, i.e. the country. The sooner Indian leaders of political thought get rid of the idea of a unitary Indian Nation .based on something like a biological fusion of the communities, the better for all concerned.

Pandit Jawahar Lal further seems to think that Muslims, while believing in democracy as a religious institution, are afraid of democracy in practice. He overlooks the fact that the communal electorates and other safeguards on which Muslims insist are only intended to prevent 80 million members of a comparatively poor and backward community from being ousted from all real advantages of democracy. The Muslim wants safeguards not because he is afraid of democracy but because he has reason to be afraid of communal oligarchy in the garb of democracy in India. He wants to ensure the substance of democracy even at the expense of its conventional form.

As for his reference to the speeches made by His Highness the Agha Khan, Dr Shafaat Ahmed and myself before a gathering of members of the House of Commons, I have only to say that the kind of statements attributed to us were never made. It is unfair to cite the impressions of a Press correspondent instead of an authorised text of our speeches in such an argument. No Indian can believe for a moment that it is impossible to govern India except through a British agency.

In conclusion, I must put a straight question to Pandit Jawahar Lal. How is India's problem to be solved if the majority

community will neither concede the minimum safeguards necessary for the protection of a minority of 80 million people nor accept the award of a third party; but continue to talk of a kind of nationalism which works out only to its own benefit? This position can admit of only two alternatives. Either the Indian majority community will have to accept for itself the permanent position of an agent of British Imperialism in the East or the country will have to be redistributed on a basis of religious, historical and cultural affinities so as to do away with the question of electorates and the communal problem in its present form.

59

Mr M.A. Jinnah's statement in reply to Babu Rajendra Prasad's offer, 26 July, 1937

I have seen the report of the statement of Babu Rajendra Prasad under the heading "Rajendra Babu returns to the charge".

Babu Rajendra Prasad begins by saying:

"I have seen Mr Jinnah's statement regarding the breakdown of the Delhi negotiations. I am afraid that there is nothing in my statement which I should withdraw."

The statement that I complained of was made by him in his interview which was published on July 6, 1937, in which he stated: "It is not correct to say that even a certain section of the influential Congress leaders was deadly opposed to the formula." I think he must be satisfied now after the statement of the Bengal leaders who say that is not true.

In what he characterises as a "sporting offer" he makes another statement which also is absolutely incorrect and without foundation. He says: "I am making a sporting offer to Mr Jinnah, that I offer to get the formula accepted by the Congress even today if he offers, as he had done then, to get signatures to it of all Mussalman leaders barring one or two whom he had named to me."

It is a conditional offer devoid of any sporting spirit. In the first place I never offered to get signatures to Babu Rajendra Prasad's formula of all Muslim leaders barring one or two whom I had named or any leader. Babu Rajendra Prasad has forgotten the genesis of our conversations. I was requested by Babu Rajendra Prasad and other Congress leaders to meet him, and the question was how to put an end to the bitter controversy

that was raging at the time over the Communal Award until a substitute was agreed upon between the communities concerned, and that we should utilise the Provincial Constitution for what it was worth and carry on our united struggle until we secure a constitution for our country which will satisfy our people. This was not acceptable to Babu Rajendra Prasad and his friends.

Next, it was suggested that if they could propose a substitute on the basis of joint electorates which would be more in the interests of the Mussalmans than the Communal Award, would I then consider it? I naturally said, if any such proposal came with the universal support of the communities concerned, namely, the Hindus and Sikhs, I would place it before the session of the All-India Muslim League without delay and in my reply to his letter asking me to meet him I wrote as follows:

Dear Rajendra Prasad,

Thank you for your letter of the 24th instant. I have consulted a few friends and I should be glad to meet you in my individual capacity for the purpose referred to in your letter as requested by you.

Yours sincerely
M.A. JINNAH

I had no authority from the League to come to any agreement and my position today is exactly the same as before. It is somewhat astonishing that Babu Rajendra Prasad should have adopted the method, the manner and the channel of approach, through which he flung this "sporting offer", with regard to an issue which involves the fate and the future of eighty millions of Mussalmans and the country at large. In all seriousness I appeal to him, does he think that this is the right way to open negotiations, through the channel of the press for the settlement of this vital and far-reaching question? His "sporting offer" amounts to this, that I must get the signatures of all Mussalman leaders from all over India except one or two and request him to get it passed by the Congress.

Surely if a substitute for the Communal Award which the Mussalmans have already accepted is to be proposed, it can only come from the Hindu and Sikh leaders who are opposed to it and the two communities directly concerned. I can repeat now what I said when we commenced our talks at Delhi in January, 1935, that if Babu Rajendra Prasad is so sure of getting the Congress to adopt his formula as a substitute for the

Communal Award, and informs me to that effect with the authority and sanction of the Congress, I will place it before the All-India Muslim League without delay.

I do not wish in any way to make the course of negotiations or settlement difficult. But I must say in self-defence that the sudden change of front and the manner, the method and the channel, namely the press, that are adopted and what is being reported in newspapers about a few Muslims in the United Provinces threatening to leave the Muslim League if I do not carry out what Babu Rajendra Prasad has enjoined me to do, lead me to suspect that it is not a genuine desire for an honourable settlement, but is an attempt to divide the Mussalmans, to split the Muslim League and to strike a blow at unity among Mussalmans for which I have been working. For until yesterday, not to go beyond the Faizpur resolution, according to the pronouncements of Pandit Jawharlal Nehru, speaking with the authority of the President of the Congress, the position was that "to talk about the rights and interests of the minorities and their safeguards was utter nonsense." The Congress, according to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the Secretary of the Congress, in their latest statements, was out to destroy the Communal Award, as it was not acceptable to them and we were told that if we wanted any settlement, we must apply to the Hindu Mahasabha.

In the meantime the Congress policy was that Mussalmans should joint the Congress unconditionally and sign their pledge. After the Congress was flushed with its majority in six provinces, it deliberately decided to ignore, nay, decided to non-cooperate with the Muslim League Parties in the various Provincial Legislatures, and they have in forming the Ministries vindicated the justice and the fair treatment to the minorities urged and promised by Mahatma Gandhi very recently by having made a good feast of all the loaves and fishes that are at present available for the Congress Party in the various Legislatures and getting a stray Mussalman to exchange a pledge overnight to accept Ministry the next morning! I regret that I should be obliged to point out these matters and that I should have to resort to a post-mortem inquisition. As to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's statement which appears side by side with that of Babu Rajendra Prasad on the 20th July, what can I say to that busybody President? What does he know of what took place between me and Babu Rajendra Prasad? He seems to carry the responsibility of the whole world on his shoulders and must poke his nose in everything except minding his own business.

Again he comes back to another point with regard to the statement which was alleged to have been issued by me as an appeal to the voters of Bundelkhand-Jhansi electorate which I have already repudiated and said that no such statement wss issued by me.

I assure the Mussalmans and the public at large that I am not in the slightest degree affected by anything that has happened in the past and nobody will welcome an honourable settlement between the Hindus and the Mussalmans more than I and nobody will be so ready to help it, and as an earnest on my part I sent a message to Mr Gandhi when he was at Tithal only in the month of May last appealing to him to take up the question of Hindu-Muslim settlement and concentrate his great influence and efforts to which I received the following reply on May 22, 1937:

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Kher has given me your message. I wish I could do something but I am utterly helpless. My faith in unity is bright as ever; only I see no daylight out of the impenetrable darkness and in such distress I cry out to God for light.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. GANDHI

In conclusion, I want to say a word to Mussalmans. Those few waverers who are ready or about to betray us for jobs need not seek excuses or loopholes to justify their threatened secession from the All-India Muslim League. They may go, but those members of the League, if they have a shred of conscience left, should tender their resignations and contest the seats again on Congress ticket. I am sure that the All-India Muslim League will be all the better without such men. To those who suffer from defeatist mentality I say, have courage and faith, *Delhi dur ast*; and I say to all Mussalmans of India to organise, consolidate and establish solidarity and unity. Service, suffering and sacrifice are absolutely essential conditions before we can achieve anything big and secure our rightful place in the national life of our country.

60

Mr M.A. Jinnah's presidential address at the session of the All-India Muslim League, Lucknow, October, 1937

This session of the All-India Muslim League is one of the most critical that have ever taken place during its existence for the last more than thirty years.

The policy and programme that you are called upon to formulate and lay down involves the fate and the future of the Mussalmans of India and the country at large. On the 12th April, 1936, the Muslim League at its session, the first time in its history, undertook the policy and programme of mass contact. The League considered the prevailing conditions and surveyed the situation as we had to face the forthcoming elections on the eve of the inauguration of the new Provincial Constitution embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, and had no alternative but to enter the field and contest the elections to the Provincial Legislatures. It was also felt that there was no alternative but to utillse the Provincial Constitution for what it was worth, although it was far from being satisfactory. I may here reproduce the resolution that was passed on the 12th April, 1936:

"Whereas the Parliamentary system of Government which is being introdnced in this country with the inauguration of the new Constitution presupposes the formation of parties with a well-defined policy and programme which facilitate the education of the electorate, and cooperation between groups with approximate aims and ideals and ensures the working of the Constitution to the best advantage; and, whereas, in order to strengthen the solidarity of the Muslim community and to secure for the Muslims their proper and effective share in the Provincial Governments, it is essential that the Muslims should organise themselves as one party, with an advanced and progressive programme, it is hereby resolved that the All-India Muslim League do take steps to contest the approaching provincial elections, and for this purpose appoint Mr Jinnah to form a Central Election Board under his presidentship, consisting of not less than 35 members, with powers to constitute and affiliate Provincial Election Boards in various provinces, having regard to the conditions of each province and devise ways and means for carrying out the aforesaid objects."

In pursuance of that decision, the Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board was established in June 1936, and also in various provinces Provincial Boards were established to give effect to the resolution and the instructions of the League. It was not without difficulty and it was no small task to be performed, in the absence of any previous preparations or any existing efficient organisation and machinery. It was a stupendous undertaking to contest elections in all the provinces especially when Mussalmans all over India are numerically in a minority and weak, educationally backward, and economically nowhere. There never had been made any systematic effort for their social and economic uplift, whereas our sister communities have gone far ahead with their organisations and the systematic programme supported by a large bulk of people, especially the Hindus, who are not only in a majority but better trained, more disciplined and far better equipped educationally, economically and financially.

But here I may mention that within a short time of about six months' work, before the elections were over, the results were very hopeful, and there is no need for us to despair. In each and every province where League Parliamentary Board was established and the League Parties were constituted we carried away about 60 and 70 per cent of the seats that were contested by the League candidates, and since the elections were over, I find that hundreds of District Leagues have been established in almost every province from the farthest corner of Madras to the North-West Frontier Province. Since April last, the Mussalmans of India have rallied round the League more and more and I feel confident that once they understand and realise the policy and programme of the Muslim League, the entire Mussalman population of India will rally round its platform and under its flag. The Muslim League stands for full national democratic self-government for India. A great deal of capital is made as to phrases more for the consumption of the ignorant and illiterate masses. Various phrases are used such as Purna Swaraj, self-government, complete independence, responsible government, substance of independence and dominion status. There are some who talk of complete independence. But it is no use having complete independence on your lips and the Government of India Act, 1935 in your hands! Those who talk of complete independence the most, mean the least what it means. Was the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in consonance with complete independence? Were the assurances that were required before the offices would be accepted and the Provincial Constitution could be worked

consistent with Purna Swaraj, and was the resolution after the assurances were refused accepting offices and working the Provincial Constitution enacted by the British Parliament and forced upon the people of India by the imperialistic power in keeping with the policy and programme and the declarations of the Congress Party? Does wrecking mean working? These paper declarations, slogans and shibboleths are not going to carry us anywhere. What India requires is a complete united front and honesty of purpose and then by whatever name you may call your government is a matter of no consequence so long as it is a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

The present leadership of the Congress, especially during the last ten years, has been responsible for alienating the Mussalmans of India more and more by pursuing a policy which is exclusively Hindu, and since they have formed the Governments in six provinces where they are in a majority they have by their words, deeds and programme shown more and more that the Mussalmans cannot expect any justice or fair-play at their hands. Wherever they are in a majority and wherever it suited them, they refused to cooperate with the Muslim League Parties and demanded unconditional surrender and signing of their pledges.

The demand was insistent: abjure your party and forswear your policy and programme and liquidate Muslim League; but where they found that they had not a majority, like the North-West Frontier Province, their sacred principle of collective responsibility disappeared, and promptly the Congress Party was allowed in that province to coalesce with any other group. That any individual Mussalman member who was willing to unconditionally surrender and sign that pledge was offered a job as a minister and was passed off as a Mussalman minister, although he did not command the confidence or the respect of an overwhelming majority of the Mussalman representatives in the legislature. These men are allowed to move about and pass off as Muslim ministers for the "loyal" services they have rendered to the Congress, by surrendering and signing the pledge unconditionally and the degree of their reward is the extent of their perfidy. Hindi is to be the national language of all India, and Bande Matram is to be the national song, and is to be forced upon all. The Congress flag is to be obeyed and revered by all and sundry. On the very threshold of what little power and responsibility is given, the majority community have clearly shown their hand that Hindustan is for the Hindus; only the Congress masquerades under the name of nationalism, whereas

the Hindu Mahasabha does not mince words. The result of the present Congress Party policy will be, I venture to say, class bitterness, communal war and strengthening of the imperialistic hold as a consequence. I dare say that the British Government will give the Congress a free hand in this direction, and it matters very little to them, nay, on the contrary, it is all to the good, so long as their interests, imperial or otherwise, are not touched and the Defence remains intact, but I feel that a fearful reaction will set in when the Congress has created more and more divisions amongst Indians themselves, and made the united front impossible.

Here it will not be out of place to state that the responsibility of the British Government is no less in the disastrous consequences which may ensue. It has been clearly demonstrated that the Governors and the Governor-General who have been given the powers and special responsibility to safeguard and protect the minorities under the Constitution which was made so much of by Lord Zetland. the Secretary of State for India, during the controversy of the assurances demanded by the Congress Party, have failed to use them and have thereby been a party to the flagrant breach of the spirit of the Constitution and the instrument of instructions in the matter of appointment of Muslim ministers. On the contrary, they have been a party to passing off men as Muslim ministers by appointing them as such, although they know full well that they do not command the confidence of the Muslim representatives or the public outside. If, in a matter like this, the Governors have shown their utter helplessness and disregard for their sacred obligations which were assumed by the British Government for the protection of minorities, could they or would they be able to afford protection in hundred and one other matters which may not come up to the surface to be known in the day-to-day working of the Legislatures and the administrative machinery? These are very serious and noteworthy signs of the time. The one wholesome lesson that I ask the Mussalmans to learn, before it is too late, is that the path before the Mussalmans is, therefore, plain. They must realise that the time has come when they should concentrate and devote their energies to self organisation and full development of their power to the exclusion of every other consideration. I have pointed out before that a section of Mussalmans is divided, that there is a group that stands with face turned towards the British. If they have not learnt by now of the bitter consequences they will never learn. God only helps those who help themselves. There is another

group which turns towards the Congress and they do so because they have lost faith in themselves. I want the Mussalmans to believe in themselves and take their destiny in their own hands. We want men of faith and resolution, who have to courage and determination and who would fight singlehanded for their convictions, although at the moment the whole world may be against them. We must develop power and strength, till the Mussalmans are fully organised and have acquired that power and strength which must come from the solidarity and the unity people.

No settlement with the majority is possible, as no Hindu leader speaking with any authority shows any concern or genuine desire for it. Honourable settlement can only be achieved between equals, and unless the two parties learn to respect and fear each other there is no solid ground for any settlement. Offers of peace by the weaker party always mean confession of weakness, and invitation to aggression. Appeals to patriotism, justice and fair-play and for the goodwill fall flat. It does not require political wisdom to realize that all safeguards and settlements would be a scrap of paper unless they are backed up by power. Politics mean power and not relying only on cries of justice or fair-play or goodwill. Look at the nations of the world, and look at what is happening every day. See what has happened to Abyssinia, look what is happening to China and Spain, and not to say of the tragedy of Palestine, to which I shall refer later.

The Congress High Command speaks in different voices. One opinion is that there is no such thing as Hindu-Muslim question, and there is no such thing as Minorities' question in the country. The other high opinion is that if a few crumbs are thrown to the Mussalmans, in their present disorganised and helpless state, you can manage them. They are sadly mistaken if they think that the Mussalmans can be imposed upon. The All-India Muslim League has now come to live, and play its just part in the world of Indian politics, and sooner it is realised and reckoned with, the better it will be for all interests concerned. The third opinion is that there is no light to be seen through the impenetrable darkness, but as the Congress goes on acquiring steength and power so that past promises of blank-cheques remain unfilled and unsigned.

I want the Mussalmans to ponder over the situation and decide their own fate by having one single definite uniform policy which should be loyally followed throughout India. The Congressite Mussalmans are making a great mistake when they preach

unconditional surrender. It is the height of defeatist mentality to throw ourselves on the mercy and goodwill of others, and the highest act of prefidy to the Mussalman community, and if that policy is adopted, let me tell you, the community will seal its doom and will cease to play its rightful part in the national life of the country and the Government. Only one thing can save the Mussalmans and energise them to regain their lost ground. They must first re-capture their own souls and stand by their lofty position and principles which form the basis of their great unity and which bind them in one body-politic. Do not be disturbed by the slogans and the taunts such as are used against the Mussalmans, "communalists", "toadies" and "reactionaries". The worst "toady" on earth, the most wicked "communalist" today amongst Muslims when he surrenders unconditionally to the Congress and abuses his own community becomes the nationalist of nationalists tomorrow. These terms and words and abuses are intended to create an inferiority complex amongst the Mussalmans and to demoralise them; and are intended to sow discord in their midst and give us a bad name in the world abroad. This is the standard of propaganda which can only be treated with contempt.

The All-India Muslim League certainly and definitely stands to safeguard the rights and interests of the Mussalmans and other minorities effectively. That is its basic and cardinal principle. That is the *Casus Beli*. That is why the Muslim League and those who stand by it have incurred the displeasure of the Congress for what else are we doing which the Congress object to? Congress is doing exactly what we decided two years ago. The League is not going to allow Mussalmans to be exploited either by the British Government or any other party or group inside the legislature or outside. The Congress with all its boasts has done nothing in the past for the Mussalmans. It has failed to inspire confidence and to create a sense of security amongst the Mussalmans and other minorities. The Congress attempt under the guise of establishing mass contact with the Mussalmans is calculated to divide and weaken and break the Mussalmans and is an effort to detatch them from their accredited leaders. It is a dangerous move and it cannot mislead any one. All such manoeuvers will not succeed notwithstanding the various blandishments, catchwords and slogans. The only honest and straightforward course is to give the minorities a fair deal. All the talk of hunger and poverty is intended to lead the people towards socialistic and communistic ideas for which India is far from prepared. The Muslim League in the present conditions considers

the policy of direct action as suicidal and futile. Two such attempts have hitherto failed and have entailed untold misery and suffering to the people, and it had to be wound up after two decades of persistent efforts in the direction with the result that a more reactionary constitution is forced upon the people, and the Congress is working it now.

To ask by a resolution the Governor-General to convey to the Secretary of State for India to call a constituent assembly on the basis of adult franchise is the height of all ignorance. It shows lack of any sense of proportion. A constituent assembly can only be called by a sovereign authority and from the seat of power—a special body of men chosen as the representatives with the authority of the sovereign people to frame such constitution of the government of the country as they may think proper, and their function ceases and the constitution so framed by them would automatically take the place and function as the constitution of the Government of the country. Who is to constitute the electorates on the basis of adult franchise, and how many representatives will be chosen by these electorates constituted on the basis of adult franchise, and what will happen to the minorities in such constituencies and what will the electorates understand and how will they make their choice of this special body of men with final authority and power to frame the constitution of this great continent? Who will direct the machinery to choose the special body of men with representative authority to frame such canstitution as they may think proper? Who will set in motion the machinery? And above all what will happen to the minorities in such a body. Is the Congress really serious that the Secretary of State is going to carry out all these requirements? When only a few days ago, the representative of the British Government speaking with the highest authority, His Excellency the Viceroy, said that he was full of hope that they might succeed in securing the federation of India in the near future, that when he came out to India he had expressed the hope that scheme of federation was on the whole one calculated to secure federation within a reasonable time after the inauguration of provincial autonomy, and that his experience of the last 18 months had confirmed him in that view regarding the establishment of federation within a reasonable time.

Taking the country as a whole, the Congress is still far from occupying the seat of authority and it is a travesty of realities to think of British Government calling a constituent assembly and for the ability of the Congress to do so is pure moonshine. Let the Congress first bring all principal communities in the country

and all principal classes of interest under its leadership. To ask the foreign Government who is the ruling and sovereign authority in this country to convene such a body before even the communal problem has been solved and before all important communities in India have accepted the leadership of the Congress is like putting the cart before the horse, and not to forget that 1/3rd of Indian India stands on a very special footing constituting the Indian States and Ruling Princes.

Instead of ploughing the sands, let the Congress at least concentrate and see that the All-India Federation scheme embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, which is more re-actionary than even the present central constitution, is not brought into being as now it is so emphatically and confidently asserted by those who speak with authority on behalf of the British Government that it is soon going to be inaugurated. What is the Congress going to do? Do they think that they can single-handed as a party prevent it? Or will some other formula be evolved and the Congress quietly accept it as a *fait accompli* as it has done the provincial constitution in spite of all the rantings of some of the foremost leaders of the Congress against it.

May I now turn and refer to the question of Palestine. It has moved the Mussalmans all over India most deeply. The whole policy of the British Government has been a betrayal of the Arabs from its very inception. Fullest advantage has been taken of their trusting nature. Great Britain has dishonoured her proclamation to the Arabs which had guaranteed to them complete independence of the Arab home-lands, and formation of an Arab Confederation under the stress of the great war. After having utilised them, by giving them false promises they installed themselves as the mandatory power with that infamous Balfour declaration, which was obviously irreconcilable and incapable of simultaneous execution, and having pursued the policy to find a national home for the Jews, Great Britain now proposes to partition Palestine, and the Royal Commission's recommendation completes the tragedy and if given effect to must necessarily lead to the complete ruination and destruction of every legitimate aspiration of the Arabs in their home-land; and now we are asked to look at the realities. But who created this situation? It has been the handiwork and brought about sedulously by the British Statesmen. The League of Nations has, it seems, and let us hope not approved of the Royal Commission's scheme and a fresh examination may take place. But is it a real effort intended to give the Arabs their due? May I point out to Great Britain that this question of Palestine if not fairly

and squarely met, boldly and courageously decided, it is going to be the turning point in the history of the British Empire. I am sure, I am speaking not only of the Mussalmans of India, but of the world, and all sections of thinking and fair-minded people will agree when I say that Great Britain will be digging its grave if she fails to honour her original proclamation, promises and intentions—pre-war and even post-war—which were so unequivocally expressed to the Arabs and world at large. I find that a very tense feeling of excitement has been created and the British Government, out of sheer desperation are resorting to repressive measures and ruthlessly dealing with the public opinion of the Arabs in Palestine. The Muslims of India will stand solid and will help the Arabs in every way they can in their brave and just struggle that they are carrying on against all odds. May I send a message on behalf of the All-India Muslim League of cheer, courage, and determination in their just cause and struggle and I am sure they will win through.

To the Mussalmans of India in every province, in every district, in every tehsil, in every town I say your foremost duty is to formulate a constructive and ameliorative programme of work for the people's welfare and to devise ways and means of social, economic and political uplift of the Mussalmans. We shall not hesitate to cooperate with any party or group in any practical and constructive programme for the welfare and advance of the province or the country. I entreat and implore that every man, woman and child should rally round one common platform and flag of the All-India Muslim League. Enlist yourself by hundreds and thousands as quickly as you can as members of the All-India Muslim League, Provincial Leagues and District Leagues. Organise yourself, establish your solidarity and complete unity. Equip yourself as trained and disciplined soldiers, create the feeling of *esprit de corps*, and of comradeship amongst yourselves. Work loyally, honestly and for the cause of your people and your country. No individual or people can achieve anything without industry, suffering and sacrifice. There are forces which may bully you, tyranise over you and intimidate you, and you may even have to suffer. But it is by going through this crucible of fire of persecution which may be levelled against you, tyranny that may be exercised, threats and intimidations may un-nerve you, but it is by resisting, by overcoming, by facing these disadvantages, hardships, and suffering and maintaining your true convictions and loyalty that a nation will emerge worthy of its past glory and history and will live to make the future history greater and more

glorious not only of India, but in the annals of the world. Eighty millions of Mussalmans in India have nothing to fear. They have their destiny in their hands, and as a well-knit, solid, organised, united force can face any danger, and withstand any opposition to its united front and wishes. There is the magic power in your own hands. Take your vital decisions—they may be grave and momentous and far-reaching in their consequences. Think hundred times before you take any decision, but once a decision is taken stand by it as one man. Be true and loyal, and I feel confident that success is with you.

61

Resolutions passed at the twenty-fifth annual session of the All-India Muslim League, Lucknow, 15-18 October, 1937

1. That the All-India Muslim League declares in the name of the Mussalmans of India that recommendations of the Royal Palestine Commission and the subsequent statement of policy presented by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Parliament conflict with their religious sentiments and in the interests of world peace demands its rescission without further delay.

The All-India Muslim League calls upon the Government of India to issue instructions to the representatives of India at the Assembly of the League of Nations that in view of the failure of the present mandatory to carry out the terms of the mandate which was never accepted by Arabs and the rest of the Islamic world and in order not to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the Arabs they shall demand the annulment of the mandate and disassociate themselves from any decision tending to perpetuate it and thus to violate the fundamental right of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine to choose the form of Government best suited to their needs and requirements as guaranteed to them under international treaties.

The All-India Muslim League appeals to the rulers of Muslim countries to continue to use their powerful influence and best endeavours to save the holy places in Palestine from the sacrilege of non-Muslim domination and the Arabs of the Holy Land from enslavement of British Imperialism backed by Jewish finance.

The All-India Muslim League places on record its complete confidence in the Supreme Muslim Council and the Arab Higher

Committee under the Leadership of His Eminence the Grand Mufti and warns the local administration in Palestine not to aggravate the resentment already created in the Muslim world by a policy of repression as advocated by the Royal Commission against the people of the country ostensibly to uphold law and order but in reality calculated to further the interest of aliens through the scheme of partition.

The All-India Muslim League expresses its entire confidence in the Leader and Members of the Delegation selected by the Palestine Conference held on September 24 and 25, 1937 and appeals to every friend of the Arabs in Palestine to raise a united voice to redress their grievances.

This Session of the All-India Muslim League warns the British Government that if it fails to alter its present pro-Jewish policy in Palestine the Mussalmans of India in consonance with the rest of the Islamic world will look upon Britain as the enemy of Islam and shall be forced to adopt all necessary measures according to the dictates of their faith.

2. This Session of the All-India Muslim League condemns the wanton demolition of the Shahidganj Mosque at Lahore as a most intolerable interference with the Law of Islam and in view of the fact that this demolition was carried out in broad daylight under the protection of British troops and British guns calls upon the British Government to restore the mosque to its original condition and thus avoid an inevitable conflict between the Muslims of India and the British Government whose representative in the Province failed to perform his elementary duty of protecting an admittedly Muslim mosque.

3. This meeting of the All-India Muslim League strongly condemns the attitude of the Congress in foisting Bande Matram as the National anthem upon the country in callous disregard of the feelings of Muslims and considers this song not merely positively anti-Islamic and idolatrous in its inspiration and ideas, but definitely subversive of the growth of genuine nationalism in India.

4. This meeting further calls upon the Muslim members of the various legislatures and public bodies in the country not to associate themselves in any manner with the highly objectionable song.

This meeting of the All-India Muslim League deprecates and protests against the formation of Ministries in certain Provinces by the Congress parties in flagrant violation of the

letter and the spirit of the Government of India Act, 1935 and instrument of instructions and condemns the Governors for their failure to enforce the special powers entrusted to them for the safeguard of the interest of the Mussalmans and other important minorities.

5. Resolved that the object of the All-India Muslim League shall be the establishment in India of Full Independence in the form of a federation of free democratic states in which the rights and interests of the Mussalmans and other minorities are adequately and effectively safeguarded in the constitution.

6. That this meeting of the All-India Muslim League records its emphatic disapproval of the scheme of the All-India Federation as embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935 and is opposed to its introduction and urges upon the British Government to refrain from its enforcement as it considers the scheme to be detrimental to the interests of the people of India generally and to those of the Muslims in particular.

7. As the Urdu language was originally an Indian language and was the result of inter-action of Hindu and Muslim cultures and it was spoken by a greater part of the people of this country it was best suited to develop a united nationality, and the attempt to replace it by Hindi might upset the structural basis of Urdu otherwise known as "Hindustani" and adversely affect the growth of comradeship between the Hindu and Muslim Sections, the All-India Muslim League calls upon all the Urdu speaking people of India to make every possible endeavour to safeguard the interests of their language in every field of activity with which the Central and the Provincial Governments were concerned and wherever the Urdu language was the language of the area, its unhampered use and development should be upheld and where it was not the predominant language, adequate arrangement should be made for teaching it as an optional subject and in all Government Offices, Courts, Legislatures, Railway and Postal departments provision should be made for its use.

Efforts should also be made to make Urdu the universal language of India.

8. That this meeting of the All-India Muslim League urges upon the British Government to take immediate steps to replace the present arbitrary form of Government in Baluchistan by a democratic one similar to those in other provinces in India.

Whereas the system of land settlement in the Province of

Assam known as the "Line System" interferes with inter-provincial migration of population, infringes the fundamental rights of citizenship, and inflicts great hardship on immigrants leading to the creation of a landless class, numbering thousands of population, the All-India Muslim League resolves that the "Line System" be immediately abolished.

9. This session of the All-India Muslim League directs the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League to take immediate steps to frame and put into effect an economic, social and educational programme with a view:

To fix working hours for factory workers and other labourers.

To fix minimum wages.

To improve housing and hygienic condition of the labourers and make provision for slum clearance.

To reduce rural and urban debts and abolish usury.

To grant a moratorium with regard to all debts whether decreed or otherwise till proper legislation has been enacted.

To secure legislation for exemption of houses from attachment or sale in execution of decrees.

To obtain security of tenure and fixation of fair rents and revenue.

To abolish forced labour.

To undertake rural uplift work.

To encourage cottage industries and small indigenous industries both in rural and urban areas.

To encourage use of Swdeshi articles specially handwoven cloth.

To establish an industrial board for development of industries and prevention of exploitation by middlemen.

To devise means for the relief of unemployment.

To advance compulsory primary education.

To reorganise secondary, university education specially scientific and technical.

To establish rifle clubs and a military college.

To enforce prohibition.

To abolish and remove un-Islamic customs and usages from Muslim society.

To organise a volunteer corps for social service.

To devise measures for attainment of full independence and invite the cooperation of all political bodies working to that end.

62

Resolution on atrocities on Muslims passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 20 March, 1938

Whereas numerous complaints have reached the Central Office of the hardship, ill-treatment and injustice that is meted out to the Muslims in various Congress Government Provinces and particularly to those who are workers and members of the Muslim League, the Council resolves that a special Committee be appointed consisting of the following members to collect all informations, make all necessary enquiries and take such steps as may be considered proper and to submit their report to the President and the Council from time to time: 1. Raja Syed Mohammad Mehdi Saheb (Chairman) 2. Mr Ali Bahadur Habib-ullah (Secretary). 3. K.B. Haji Rashid Ahmad Saheb. 4. Syed Ashraf Ahmad. 5. Moulvi Abdul Ghani Saheb, M.L.A. 6. Mian Ghiasuddin Saheb, M.L.A. 7. Syed Zakir Ali Saheb. 8. Syed Hassan Reyaz Saheb. 9. Syed Taqui Hadi Saheb.

63

Resolution on the Shahidganj Mosque dispute passed by the special session of the All-India Muslim League, Calcutta, 17 & 18 April, 1938

While endorsing the resolution of the Council of the All-India Muslim League passed at Delhi on the 20th of March, 1938, this Special Session of the All-India Muslim League in view of the fact that the Punjab Government has given an assurance to the effect that they are adopting every means for arriving at an honourable settlement of the Shahidganj problem, assures them of its cooperation and assistance in bringing about the settlement and appeals to Mussalmans to create and maintain a peaceful atmosphere in order to facilitate that settlement.

64

Resolutions regarding League-Congress negotiations passed by the Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League

The Executive Council of the Muslim League resolves that the following note be sent to Mr Subbas Bose, President of the Congress, in reply to his letter dated the 15th of May 1938 with a covering letter by the President.

Copy of the letter of Mr M.A. Jihnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League addressed to Mr S. Bose, the President of the All-India Congress Committee.

Bombay,
5th June, 1938

Dear Mr Bose,

I am enclosing herewith the unanimous opinion of the Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League as promised by me in my letter dated the 16th of May with reference to the note given to me by you on behalf of the Congress and your letter of the 15th of May, 1938.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. JINNAH

The Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League has considered the note handed over by the President, Mr S. Bose, on behalf of the Congress to Mr Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League, on the 14th May and his letter of the 15th May, 1938, and find that it is not possible for the All-India Muslim League to treat or negotiate with the Congress the question of Hindu-Muslim settlement except on the basis that the Muslim League is the authoritative and representative organization of the Mussalmans of India.

The Council have also considered the letter of Mr Gandhi dated the 22nd May, 1938 and are of opinion that it is not desirable to include any Muslim in the personnel of the proposed Committee that may be appointed by the Congress.

The Executive Council wish to make it clear that it is the declared policy of the All-India Muslim League that all other

minorities should have their rights and interests safeguarded so as to create a sense of security amongst them and win their confidence and the All-India Muslim League will consult the representatives of such minorities and any other interest as may be involved, when necessary.

Copy of Letter from Mr Bose to Mr Jinnah, Bombay, May 15, 1938

Dear Mr Jinnah,

Last night I gave you a note explaining our position. You asked me what constructive proposals we had to make. I think the note is self-explanatory. Having made known the Congress reaction to your suggestion, according to us, it remains now to proceed to the next, stage, namely appointment of respective committees which will jointly settle the terms of understanding.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) SUBHAS C. BOSE

Copy of the note handed over by Mr Bose to Mr Jinnah

In the course of the talks between the Congress President and Mr M.A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, Mr Jinnah suggested that any agreement that might be arrived at should be based on a clear understanding of the position of the Congress and that of the Muslim League. He proposed that the conversations should proceed on the following basis:

"The All-India Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organization of the Indian Muslims, and the Congress as the authoritative and representative organization of the sölid body of Hindu opinion, have hereby agreed to the following terms by way of a pact between the two major communities and as a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question."

After further consideration a somewhat different wording was suggested by him as follows:

"The Congress and the All-India Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organization of the Mussalmans of India have hereby agreed to the following terms of a Hindu-Muslim settlement by way of a pact."

The second statement, though shorter, apparently embodies the same idea which is given in the first, that is, that the

Congress should represent the Hindus and the Muslim League, the Mussalmans.

The Congress cannot possibly consider itself or function as if it represented one community only, even though that might be the majority community in India. Its doors must inevitably be open to all communities and it must welcome all Indians who agree with its general policy and methods. It cannot accept the position of representing one community and thus itself becoming a communal organization. At the same time the Congress is perfectly willing to confer and cooperate with other organizations which represent minority interests.

It is obvious that the Mussalmans of India, though a minority in the whole country, form a very considerable part of the population and their wishes and desires must be considered in any scheme affecting India. It is also true that the All-India Muslim League is an organization representing a large body of Muslim opinion which must carry weight. It is for this reason that the Congress has endeavoured to understand the viewpoint of the League and to come to an understanding with it. The Congress, however, would be bound to consult other existing Muslim organizations which have cooperated with the Congress in the past. Further in the event of other group or minority interests being involved, it will be necessary to consult representatives of such interests.

Copy of letter from Mr Jinnah to Mr Bose

Bombay,
16th May, 1938

Dear Mr Bose,

I acknowledge the receipt of a note you handed over to me on behalf of the Congress on the 14th, and also I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 15th of May, 1938. The matter will be placed before the Executive Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League at a meeting to be called in the first week of June and I will communicate to you the decision as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. JINNAH

65

Resolutions passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, New Delhi, 30-31 July, 1938

Resolved that the following letter on behalf of the Executive Council be sent to Mr Bose, President of the Congress, in reply to his letter dated Wardha, 25th July, 1938 addressed to Mr M.A. Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League.

Copy of the letter of Mr M.A. Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League, addressed to Mr S. Bose, the President of the Congress

2nd August, 1938

Dear Mr Bose,

I placed your letter dated 25th July, 1938 before the meeting of the Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League.

The Executive Council gave its earnest attention and careful consideration to the arguments which were urged in your letter for persuading it not to claim the status it has done in its resolution No. 1 already communicated to you. I am desired to state that in defining the status, the Council was not actuated by any motive of securing an admission, but had merely stated an accepted fact.

The Council is fully convinced that the Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative political organization of the Mussalmans of India. This position was accepted when the Congress-League Pact was arrived at in 1916 at Lucknow and even since, till 1935 when Jinnah-Rajendra Prasad conversation took place, it has not been questioned. The All-India Muslim League, therefore, does not require any admission or recognition from the Congress nor did the resolution of the Executive Council passed at Bombay. But in view of the fact that the position—in fact the very existence—of the League had been questioned by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Congress, in one of his statements wherein he asserted that there were only two parties in the country, viz. the British Government and the Congress, it was considered necessary by the Executive Council to inform the Congress of the basis on

which the negotiations between the two organisations could proceed.

Besides, the very fact that Congress approached the Muslim League to enter into negotiations for a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question it presupposed the authoritative and representative character of the League and as such its right to come to an agreement on behalf of the Mussalmans of India.

The Council are aware of the fact that there is a Congress coalition government in N.-W.F.P. and also that there are some Muslims in the Congress organisation in other provinces. But the Council is of opinion that these Muslims in the Congress do not and cannot represent the Mussalmans of India, for the simple reason that their number is very insignificant and that as members of the Congress they have disabled themselves from representing or speaking on behalf of the Muslim community. Were it not so, the whole claim of the Congress alleged in your letter regarding its national character would fall to the ground.

As regards "the other Muslim organisations" to which reference has been made in your letter, but whom you have not even named, the Council considers that it would have been more proper if no reference had been made to them. If they collectively or individually had been in a position to speak on behalf of the Mussalmans of India, the negotiations with the Muslim League for a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question would not have been initiated by the Presidents of the Congress and Mr Gandhi. However, so far as the Muslim League is concerned it is not aware that any Muslim political organisation has ever made a claim that it can speak or negotiate on behalf of the Muslims of India. It is, therefore, very much to be regretted that you should have referred to "other Muslim organisations" in this connection.

The Council is equally anxious to bring about a settlement of "the much vexed Hindu-Muslim question" and thus hasten the realization of the common goal, but it is painful to find that subtle arguments are being introduced to cloud the issue and retard the progress of the negotiations.

In view of the facts stated above the Council still hopes that the representative character of the Muslim League will not be questioned and that the Congress will proceed to appoint a committee on that basis.

With reference to the second resolution, the Council wishes to point out that it considered undesirable the inclusion of

Mussalmans in the Committee that might be appointed by the Congress because it would meet to solve and settle the Hindu-Muslim question and so in the very nature of the issues involved they would not command the confidence of either Hindus or the Mussalmans and their position indeed would be most embarrassing. The Council, therefore, request you to consider the question in the light of the above observations.

With reference to the third resolution it was the memorandum of the Congress referred to in your letter dated the 15th of May, 1938, in which mention of other minorities was made and the Muslim League expressed its willingness to consult them, if and when it was necessary in consonance with its declared policy.

As regards your desire for the release of the correspondence, including this letter, for publication the Council has no objection to your doing so.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. JINNAH

Copy of letter of Mr Subhas Chandra Bose, Pvesident of All-India Congress Committee addressed to Mr M.A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League

Wardha,
25th July, 1938

Dear Mr Jinnah,

The Working Committee has given all the attention it was possible for it to give to the resolutions of the Muslim League you were good enough to enclose with your letter of the 6th June, 1938. The first resolution of the League Council defines the status of the League. If it means that before we proceed to set up a machinery for considering the terms of settlement of the communal question, the Congress should recognise the status as defined in that resolution, there is an obvious difficulty. Though the resolution does not use the adjective 'only', the language of the resolution means that the adjective is understood. Already the Working Committee has received warnings against recognising the exclusive status of the League. There are Muslim organisation which have been functioning independently of the Muslim League. Some of them are staunch supporters of the Congress. Moreover, there are individual Muslims who are Congressmen, some of whom exercise no inconsiderable influence

in the country. Then there is the Frontier Province which is overwhelmingly Muslim and which is solidly with the Congress. You will see that in the face of these known facts it is not only impossible, but improper for the Congress to make the admission which the first resolution of the League Council apparently desires the Congress to make. It is suggested that the status of organisations does not accrue to them by any defining of it. It comes through the service to which a particular organisation has dedicated itself. The Working Committee, therefore, hopes that the League Council will not ask the Congress to do the impossible. Is it not enough that the Congress is not only willing but eager to establish the friendliest relations with the League and to come to an honourable understanding over the much vexed Hindu-Muslim question?

At this stage it may perhaps be as well to state the Congress claim. Though it is admitted that the largest number of persons to be found on the numerous Congress registers are Hindus, Congress has a fairly large number of Muslims and members of other communities professing different faiths. It has been an unbroken tradition with the Congress to represent all communities, all races, and classes to whom India is their home. From its inception it has often had distinguished Muslims as Presidents and as General Secretaries who enjoyed the confidence of the Congress and of the country. The Congress tradition is that though a Congressman does not cease to belong to the Faith in which he is born and bred up, no one comes to the Congress by virtue of his faith; he is in and out of the Congress by virtue of his endorsement of the political principles and policy of the Congress. The Congress, therefore, is in no sense a communal organisation. In fact, it has always fought the communal spirit because it is detrimental to the growth of pure and undefiled nationalism. But whilst the Congress makes this claim, and has sought, with more or less success, to live up to the claim, the Working Committee asks for no recognition from the League Council. The Committee would be glad if your Council would come to an understanding with the Congress in order that we might achieve national solidarity and wholeheartedly work for realising our common destiny.

As to the second resolution of the Council, I am afraid that it is not possible for the Working Committee to conform to the desire expressed therein.

The third resolution, the Working Committee is unable to understand. So far as the Working Committee is aware, the Muslim League is purely a communal organisation, in the sense

that it seeks to serve Muslim interests and its membership too is open only to Muslims. The Working Committee has all along understood that so far as the League is concerned, it desires, and rightly, a settlement with the Congress on the Hindu-Muslim question and not on questions affecting all minorities. So far as the Congress is concerned, if the other minorities have a grievance against the Congress, it is always ready to deal with them as it is its bounden duty to do, being by its very constitution and organisation representative of all India without distinction of caste or creed.

In view of the foregoing, I hope that it will be possible for us to take up the next stage in our negotiations for reaching settlement.

It is suggested that as the previous correspondence has already been published, it would be wise to take the public into confidence and publish the subsequent correspondence between us. If you are agreeable these documents will be immediately released for publication.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) SUBHAS BOSE

66

Resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Karachi, 8 October, 1938

The Executive Council, considered the letter of the Congress President and authorised the President, Mr M.A. Jinnah to send the following reply:

Copy of the letter af Mr M.A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, addressed to Mr Bose, President of the Congress

Little Gibbs Road,
Bombay,
10th October, 1938.

Dear Mr Bose,

I am in receipt of your letter dated the 2nd of October, which was placed before the Executive Council. I am authorised to state in reply as follows:

The Executive Council of the All-India Muslim League regret very much that the Working Committee of the Congress should have entirely misread my letter dated the 2nd of August 1938 which is quite clear and does not require any elucidation of further interpretation. The Muslim League are still ready to proceed with the negotiations for settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question on the basis defined by my letter referred to above and would appoint its representatives to meet the Committee that may be appointed by the Congress on the footing indicated by us in our three resolutions of the 5th of June, 1938, already communicated to you.

As all the correspondence so far in this connection has been published I am issuing this to the Press.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. JINNAH

Copy of the letter of Mr Subhas Chandra Bose, the Presideut of the Congress addressed to Mr M.A. Jinnah, the President of the All-India Muslim League

Calcutta,
2nd October, 1938.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

Your letter of the 2nd August, 1938 has been placed before the Working Committee. After due deliberation it has resolved to reply as follows:

"Though there are inaccuracies in your letter no purpose will be served by dwelling on them. The substance of your letter seems to be that the League does not expect the Congress, whether implicitly or explicitly, to acknowledge its status as the authoritative Muslim organisation of India. If this view is accepted by the League, I am authorised to state that the Working Committee will confer with the Committee that may be appointed by the League to draw up the terms of settlement.

"The Working Committee will be represented by at least five of its members at the sittings of the Conference.

"As the previous correspondence has already been released for publication, I am taking the liberty of issuing this to the Press."

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) S. BOSE

67

Resolution on the Wardha Scheme passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 4 December, 1938

Resolved that this meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League appoints a committee consisting of the gentlemen noted below who shall report on the following points at the next meeting of the League at Patna:

1. Whether the Wardha Scheme would have the effect of preventing or circumscribing the progress of the Urdu language and Urdu script and whether it would tend to obliterate or weaken the religious traditions and culture of the Indian Muslims so that they might lose their separate national identity and be moulded according to the political ideals of the Congress.
2. Whether it is essential that the Muslims should have their own separate organisation for education which should be under their own control and how this could be effected.

It was further resolved that within three months the Committee shall submit to the All-India Muslim League an educational scheme which should provide such education for Muslim boys and girls as would create in them an Islamic mentality, strengthen the Islamic characteristics, and at the same time, fully equip them to meet the exigencies of the present age.

1. Dr Zafarul Hasan. 2. Dr Kadri. 3. Syed Nawab Ali Saheb. 4. Maulana Zafar Ali Khan. 5. Dr Khalifa Shujauddin. 6. Karimurraza Khan Saheb. 7. Maulana Burhanul Haq Saheb. 8. Raja Saheb Pirpur, Convener of the Committee.

68

Resolution regarding the Punjab Premier's Statement on War passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 4 December, 1938

The following resolution was moved:

"The All-India Muslim League Council declares that the speech of Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan at Simla assuring the

British Government of unconditional support in men and money in case of war does in no way reflect the opinion of the Mussalmans of India and warns responsible members of the Muslim League against making pronouncements of such a nature without reference to the League."

The Hon'ble Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan opposed the resolution. Mr M.A. Jinnah the President of the League, intervened in the debate.

The house enunciated the principle that in future any announcement or statement on a vital matter by any prominent member of the League, particularly by the members of the Working Committee should not be made without the authority of the Working Committee or in a case of emergency in consultation with the President.

69

Extracts from Quaid-i-Azam's Presidential Address at the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Patna, 26 December, 1938

I will now refer to the position of the Muslim League. It was only three years ago that we laid down the policy and programme of the All-India Muslim League at Bombay. The position at that time was this. Of the intelligentsia of the Muslims who were in the forefront of what is called political life, most—I do not say all—were careerists. They chose their place according to their convenience either in the bureaucratic camp or in the other camp, that is the Congress camp. Those who thought that they could better their position by joining the bureaucratic camp joined the same. The others thought that they could get position and power in the Congress camp and joined that camp. Their object was how best to make careers for themselves. So far as the masses were concerned and so far as my dear young friends the Muslim youth were concerned, they were all hypnotised by the Congress falsehood. The youth believe in slogans and catchwords. They were caught right in the net that was spread for them by the Congress. They were led into the belief that the Congress was fighting for the freedom of the motherland. Being most honest themselves they could not believe that other people could be otherwise. They were led to believe that the question was really an economic one and that they were fighting for *dal bhat*, for the labour and the *kisans*. Their pure, untutored minds became easy victims of the Congress net. When we, who

saw through the game and understood the inward meaning of the Congress leaders' move, tried to make them understand that they were being misled, we were dubbed reactionaries, communalists and much else besides.

That was the position in 1936. I am glad to say that things have now changed. One thing has been demonstrated beyond doubt, namely, that the Congress High Command wanted the Mussalmans to be a mere understudy of the Congress, mere foot-pages of the Congress leaders, to be used, governed and brought under the heels when they had served the purpose of the Congress. The Congress leaders wanted them to submit unconditionally to the Hindu raj. That game has now been fully exposed. We have got ample proofs of it. The Chairman of the Reception Committee has some of those proofs in the address. I congratulate him for his most eloquent exposition of the true state of affairs in this country and also of the aims and objects of the Congress.

The Congress has now, you must be aware, killed every hope of Hindu-Muslim settlement in the right royal fashion of Fascism. The Congress does not want any settlement with the Muslims of India. As the Chairman of Reception Committee has said in the address, the Congress wants the Muslims to accept the settlement as a gift from the majority. The Congress High Command makes the preposterous claim that thay are entitled to speak on behalf of the whole of India, that they alone are capable of delivering goods. Others are asked to accept the gift as from a mighty sovereign. The Congress High Command declared that they will redress the grievances of the Muslims, and they expect the Muslims to accept this declaration. I want to make it plain to all concerned that we Muslims want no gifts. The Muslims of India have made up our minds to have our fullest rights but we shall have them as rights, not gifts or concessions.

As I have said before, there are four forces at play in this country. Firstly, there is the British Government; secondly, there are the rulers and people of the Indian States; thirdly, there are the Hindus; and fourthly, there are Muslims. The Congress Press may clamour as much as it likes, they may bring out their morning, afternoon, evening and night editions, the Congress leaders may cry as much as they like that Congress is a national body. But I say it is not true. The Congress is nothing but a Hindu body. That is the truth and the Congress leaders know it. The presence of the few Muslims—the few misled and misguided ones and the few who are there with ulterior motives—does not, cannot make it a national body. I challenge anybody to

deny that the Congress is mainly a Hindu body. I ask, does the Congress represent the Muslims? (Voices: no, no.)

I ask, does the Congress represent the Christians? (Voices: no, no.) I ask, does the Congress represent the Scheduled Castes? (Voices: no, no.) I ask, does the Congress represent the non-Brahmans? (Voices no, no.)

I say the Congress does not even represent all the Hindus. What about the Hindu Mahasabha? What about the Liberal Federation? The Congress, no doubt, is the largest single party in the country. But it is nothing more than that. It may arrogate to itself whatever titles it likes; the Congress High Command, in the intoxication of power, like persons who are drunk, may make any claims it pleases them to make. But such claims canont alter the true character of the Congress. It remains what it is—mainly a Hindu body.

Such claims might have hoodwinked some people for some time but they cannot hoodwink all the people all the time, and can certainly not hoodwink the Muslims any longer. I am convinced—I think you are also now convinced, and many who are not yet convinced will soon be convinced, and those who are honestly mistaken now, not those who are dishonest in their conviction, will also be convinced—that the Congress is not a national body. It is a misfortune of our country; indeed, it is a tragedy that the High Command of the Congress is determined, absolutely determined, to crush all other communitites and cultures in this country and establish Hindu raj. They talk of Swaraj, but they mean only Hindu raj. They talk of national government, but they mean only Hindu government. But the bubble has been pricked too soon. Intoxicated with power gained under the new constitution, with the majority in six or seven provinces the Congress game has been exposed a little too soon. What did the Congress do when it got the power? With all its pretensions of nationalism, it straightway started with the Bande Matram. It is admitted that Bande Matram is not the national song, yet it is sung as such and thrust upon others. It is sung not only in their own gatherings, but Muslim children in Government and Municipal schools too are compelled to sing it. Muslim children must accept Bande Matram as their national song, no matter whether their religious beliefs permit them to do so or not. It is idolatrous and a hymn of hate against Muslims.

Take the case of the Congress flag. Admittedly it is not the national flag of India, yet that flag must be respected by everyone and hoisted on every Government and public building.

It does not matter if the Muslims object to it, the Congress flag must be paraded as the national flag of India and thrust upon the Muslims.

Take next the case of Hindi-Hindustani. I need not add to what has already been said on the subject by the Chairman of the Reception Committee. Is there any doubt now in the mind of anyone that the whole scheme of Hindi-Hindustani is intended to stifle and suppress Urdu? (Voices: "no doubt.")

Take next the Wardha scheme of education. Were the Muslims taken into confidence when the scheme was under preparation? The whole scheme was conceived and its details worked out behind the back of the Muslims. Who is the author of the scheme? Who is the genius behind it? Mr Gandhi, I have no hesitation in saying that it is Mr Gandhi who is destroying the ideal with which the Congress was started. He is the one man responsible for turning the Congress into an instrument for the revival of Hinduism. His ideal is to revive Hindu religion and establish Hindu raj in this country, and he is utilising the Congress to further this object.

The reaction of the Muslims to such a scheme of education could not but be what it has been all over the country. You have seen the Pirpur Report and I need not add to what has been described in that document. The position may be summed up in one sentence. Today Hindu mentality and outlook is being carefully nurtured and Muslims are being forced to accept the Hindu ideals in their daily life. Have Muslims anywhere done anything of the sort? Have they anywhere sought to impose Muslim culture on the Hindus? Yet whenever Muslims have raised the slightest voice of protest against the imposition of Hindu culture on them, they have been branded as communalists and disturbers of peace, and the repressive machinery of the Congress Governments have been set in motion against them. Take the cases that have occurred in Bihar. Who have suffered suppression of culture under the Congress Government? It is the Muslims. Against whom are the repressive measures taken, prohibitory orders issued and among whom are arrests made? It is the Muslims. I should like to know a single instance—I am prepared to learn and correct myself—a single instance where the Muslim League or Muslim individuals may have tried to force their own culture upon the Hindus in the last eighteen months. (Cries: nowhere).

I do not wish to dwell longer upon this. I have done with it, so far the Congress is concerned. As regards the Mussal-

mans I can say that it is a matter of great congratulation to All-India Muslim League that it has succeeded in awakening a remarkable national consciousness among the Muslims. Muslims, as I said before, were like men who had lost their moral, cultural and olitical consciousness. You have not yet got to the fringe of acquiring that moral, cultural and political consciousness. You have only reached that stage at which there has come awakening —your political consciousness has been stirred.

Today you find—apart from the fact whether the Congress claims are right or wrong—today you find that the Hindus have to a very large degree acquired that essential quality, moral, cultural and political consciousness, and it has become the national consciousness of the Hindus. This is the force behind them. That is the force I want the Muslims to acquire. When you have acquired that, believe me, I have no doubt in my mind, you will realise what you want. The counting of heads may be a very good thing, but it is not the final arbiter of the destiny of nations. You have yet to develop a national self and national individuality. It is a big task, and, as I have told you, you are yet only on the fringe of it. But I have great hopes of our success. The developments that have already taken place are almost miraculous. I never dreamad we could make this wonderful demonstration which we see today. But even then we are only on the fringe of the problem.

Among the immediate issues we have to grapple with, which may come up before the Subjects Committee, is the question of Palestine. I know how deeply Muslim feelings have been stirred over the issue of Palsetine. I know Muslims will not shrink from any sacrifice if required to help the Arabs who are engaged in the fight for their national freedom. Men, who are fighting for the freedom of their country, have been described as gangsters and subjected to all forms of repression. For defending their homelands they are being put down at the point of the bayonet and with the help of martial laws. But no nation, no people who are worth living as a nation, can achieve anything great without making great sacrifices which the Arabs of Palestine are making. All our sympathies are with those valiant martyrs who are fighting the battle of freedom against usurpers. They are being subjected to monstrous injustices which are being practised by British imperialism with the ulterior motive of placating international Jewry, which commands the money bags. That question we will have to consider.

Another question that will come up for consideration is the situation that is developing in the Indian States. You have heard

the Chairman of the Reception Committee on that subject. One point I would like to add to this observation. As you are all aware, we are in fullest sympathy with the aspirations of the States' people. I am convinced, however, as I am convinced about the real objects of the Congress, that the motive of the Congress championing the rights of the States' people is far from what it is made out to be. I would like to put only one question. Why all this agitation in the States? Why are all the forces being let loose in the name of the Arya Samajists and the Hindu Mahasabha in the Hyderabad State? I would ask the Congress, what is it doing in Kashmir? The Arya Samajists, the Hindu Mahasabha and Congress nationalists, as also the press, the subservient press of the Congress, why are they silent about the affairs of the Kashmir State? Is it because Kashmir is a Hindu State? Is it because the vast majority of the subject people of Kashmir State is Muslim? I have no doubt about the real meaning of the Congress solicitude for the people of the Indian States. Mr Subhas Chandra Bose has said in one of his speeches that the Congress wants to make an alliance with the people of the Indian States. May I ask, do they want to make an alliance only with those who are Hindus or also with the Mussalmans? According to the present constitution of Muslim League, the League cannot interfere in the affairs of the Indian States. But I want to make it clear that if the Congress pursues its campaign in Muslim State like Hyderabad with the ulterior motive which undoubtedly is inspiring it at present, the Muslim League would have to consider afresh the question of interference with the affairs of Indian States. We cannot leave our Muslim brethren in the Hindu States at the "tender mercies" of their oppressors and those who wish to exploit them.

The next question that you will have to consider is that of the Federation. Let the Congress continue to say that they will never accept the Federation. But I tell you I do not at all believe in the professions of the Congress. The Congress will tumble into it just as it tumbled into the Provincial part of the Constitution. Mr Subhas Chandra Bose was loud in his declaration the other day that whatever individual Congressmen might say here and there, the Congress as a whole was determined to reject the Federation, lock, stock and barrel. I do not believe in such declarations. I know another Congress leader has said that revision and modification will satisfy them, and if the elective principle was accepted, it would appease the Congress and yet another leader declares that if the Federal Scheme could be so altered as to give them the substance of independence, the Congress might work it and in that way the undesirable and

unworkable Federal Constitution might be made a desirable and workable one. I say the whole idea behind the Congress leaders' move is once again to deceive the Muslims. I want to tell those leaders, however, that they cannot deceive the Muslims any more. The Muslims are not what they were three years ago. The whole game of the Congress is and has been to get a substantial majority in this wretched, highly objectionable and rotten Constitution which they want to enjoy. If they get a majority, they will accept the Federation with utmost glee, and then they will be in to pursue their nefarious scheme of destroying the Muslim culture and organization and to build up the Congress organisation as the one and only totalitarian organisation of the Fascist brand. And then they will be able to establish their ideal of Hindu raj in Hindustan.

The Congress leaders know what they are aiming at. They have got their majorities in seven provinces and have Congress governments there. There are only four provinces left. The covetuous eyes of the Congress leaders are now cast upon these provinces. Every now and then they declare that the non-Congress governments in these provinces are tottering, in spite of their majorities, struggling on their last legs. The Congress leaders think that in these four provinces the Ministries are not very strong. But it is not difficult to see through the Congress game. They want to see a Congress government in whichever of these provinces they can. I had a talk with some friends of the North-West Frontier Province. I am told that in that province our coreliogionists—credulous Pathans as they are—have been told that the Congress is for the good of the people, that the Muslim League is the supporter of imperialism and an ally of imperialism! I say there cannot be greater falsehood than the allegation that the Muslim League is an ally of imperialism. Inside the legislature or outside the legislature have I on any single occasion supported imperialism, not to speak of proving myself an ally of imperialism? (Voices: no, no.)

I am sure even if there were a few amongst Muslims who had thought in the past that the Muslims might gain their end by alliance with British imperialism, they have now been thoroughly disillusioned. I say the Muslim League is not going to be an ally of anyone, but would be the ally of even the devil if need be in the interests of Muslims.

(A pin-drop silence suddenly appeared to seize the House at this stage.)

Mr Jinnah paused for a moment and then continued:

It is not because we are in love with imperialism; but in politics one has to play one's game as on the chess-board. I say the Muslims and the Muslim League have only one ally and that ally is the Muslim nation, and one and only one to whom they look for help is God? (Applause.)

The Congress game with regard to Federation is very clever. If the Congress can gain the control over the Federal machinery, then, by means of direct and indirect powers vested in the Federal Government, the Congress would be able to reduce to nonentity the Governments of the Hon'ble Mr Fazlul Haq in Bengal and the Hon'ble Sir Sikander Hayat Khan in the Punjab. So in the end the Congress will have seven provinces where they enjoy overwhelming numerical majority as a gift of God, and the other four provinces where Muslims dominate will be the feudatories of the Congress High Command.

If I am right in my judgment, that is the objective of the Congress. Therefore, I say the Congress opposition to the Federation is not honest. Am I to blame for it? Am I wrong? (Voices: no, no.)

Ladies and Gentlemen, now it is for you and you alone to make your decision. All the responsibilities will be yours. You are face to face with a life and death struggle. You should not allow your attention to be deflected by small questions. So and so have not been taken in the Working Committee of the League; so and so should not be in the League; such small matters should not divert your attention from the main issues confronting the community. Only this morning some young men came to me and complained about the personnel of the League. They said that certain persons, whose names I need not mention, should not be in the League. To those young men as well as to others I say that the Muslim League is not yet what it should be. I am prepared to admit that there are men who are not true leaders. But the Muslim League is the organisation of all Muslims. It is your organisation. Let me tell my young friends, if they want to purify the Muslim League, if they want to raise the Muslim League to the highest glory, it is no use keeping out and finding faults with it. Come in, and if there is anything wrong with it, put it right. (Applause.)

70

Resolutions passed at the Twenty-sixth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Patna, 26-29 December, 1938

Direct Action

That having regard to the atrocities that have been committed and that elementary rights of the Muslims have been trampled upon in a systematic manner in Bihar, U.P. and C.P. and that the Government of these provinces have failed to redress their grievances or protect even the elementary rights of the Mussalmans in these provinces in spite of all constitutional methods adopted so far by the Muslims, this session of the All-India Muslim League is, therefore, of opinion that the time has now come to authorise the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League to decide and resort to "Direct Action" if and when necessary.

Palestine

It is the considered opinion of the All-India Muslim League that the unjust Balfour Declaration and the subsequent policy of repression adopted by the British Government in Palestine aim at making their sympathy for the Jews a pretext for incorporating that country into the British Empire with a view to strengthen British Imperialism, and to frustrate the idea of a federation of Arab States and its possible union with other Muslim States. They also want to use sacred places in Palestine as aerial and naval bases for their future military activities. The atrocities that have been perpetrated on the Arabs for the attainment of this object have no parallel in history.

The Muslim League Session regards those Arabs who are being subjected to all kinds of persecutions and repressions and who are making all sacrifices for preserving their sacred land, protecting their national rights and emancipating their motherland as heroes and martyrs and congratulates them on their bravery and sacrifice and warns the British Government that if it does not forthwith stop the influx of Jews into Palestine and does not include in the proposed conference the Grand Mufti, the genuine leaders of the Arabs as well as the representatives of the Indian Mussalmans, the conference will be nothing but a farce.

This session declares that the problem of Palestine is the problem of the Muslims of the whole world, and if the British Government fails to do justice to the Arabs and fulfil the demands of the Muslims of the world, the Indian Muslims will adopt any programme and will be prepared to make any sacrifice that may be decided upon by a Muslim International Conference at which the Muslims of India are duly represented in order to save the Arabs from British exploitation and Jewish usurpation.

The session of the League warns British Government that, if they persist in trying to give a practical shape to the idea prevalent among certain sections of the British and the Americans that Palestine be made the national home of the Jews, it will lead to a state of perpetual unrest and conflict.

Women's Committee

Whereas it is necessary to afford adequate opportunities to women for their development and growth in order to participate in the struggle for social, economic and political emancipation of the Muslim nation in India, this session of the All-India Muslim League resolves that an All-India Muslim Women's Sub-Committee be formed of the following members with powers to co-opt with the following objects in view:

(*a*) To organise provincial and district women's Sub-Committees under the Provincial and District Muslim League.

(*b*) To enlist larger number of women to the membership of the Muslim League.

(*c*) To carry on intensive propaganda amongst the Muslim women throughout India in order to create in them a sense of greater political consciousness.

(*d*) To advise and guide them in all such matters as mainly rest on them for the uplift of the Muslim society.

Punjab: 1. Begum Shah Nawaz 2. Mrs Rashida Latif. 3. Lady Jamal Khan. 4. Lady Abdul Kadir.

Bengal: 1. Begum Shahabuddin. 2. Mrs M.M. Ispahani.

Bombay: 1. Miss F .Jinnah. 2. Mrs Faiz Tyabji. 3. Begum Hafiz-ud-Din.

U.P.: 1. Begum Habibullah. 2. Begum Aizaz Rasul. 3. Begum Wasim. 4. Begum Mohammad Ali. 5. Begum Nawab Ismail Khan. 6. Rahilla Khatoon.

C.P.: 1. Miss Nadir Jehan of Seoni. 2. Begum Nawab Siddique Ali Khan.

Bihar: 1. Lady Imam. 2. Begum Akhtar.

Assam: 1. Mrs Ataur Rahman. 2. Miss J. Khan.

Sind: 1. Lady Haroon. 2. Lady Hidayatullah. 3. Begum Shaban. 4. Mrs Hatim Tyabji.

Delhi : 1. Mrs Hussain Malik. 2. Mrs Najmul Hasan. 3. Begum Rahman.

N.-W.F.P.: 1. Begum Haji Sadulla Khan. 2. Mrs Khawaja Alla Bux.

Madras: 1. Mrs. Ayisha Kulhamoro Haji. 2. Mrs Qureshi.

Federal Scheme

The All-India Muslim League reiterates its view that the scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is not acceptable, but in view of the further developments that have taken place or may take place from time to time, it hereby authorises the President of the All-India Muslim League to adopt such course as may be necessary with a view to explore the possibility of a suitable alternative which will safeguard the interests of the Mussalmans and other minorities in India.

71

Resolution passed at the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference, Karachi, 8-9 October, 1938

Whereas the refusal on the part of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress to negotiate a communal settlement with the All-India Muslim League, on the plea that the All-India Muslim League is not the sole representative body of the Mussalmans of India indicates the Congress resolve to perpetually divide and rule the Muslim community, and thus once more mar the prospects of an amicable and peaceful solution of the Indian minorities problem, for which the League has tried in vain for more than 15 years.

Whereas the Congress has by means of its powerful press and purse, launched a campaign of Muslim Mass Contact to cause disruption and division in the Muslim community with the object of deceiving the world into the belief that it is the sole representative organisation of entire India.

Whereas it has deliberately established purely Hindu rule in certain provinces by forming ministries either without Muslim ministers or with Muslim ministers having no following among Muslim members, in direct and flagrant violation of the letter and spirit of the Government of India Act, 1935 and the Instrument of Instructions.

Whereas the ministries so formed have established a sort of rule which has for its aim the intimidation and demoralisation of Muslims, the extermination of the healthy and nation-building influences of Muslim culture, the supression of Muslim religious customs and their religious obligations and elimination of their political rights as a separate community.

Whereas it has in open defiance of the democratic principles persistently endeavoured to render the power of the Muslim majorities ineffective and important in the North-Western Provinces, Bengal, the Punjab and Sind by trying to bring into power or by supporting coalition ministries not enjoying the confidence of the majority of Muslim members and the Muslim masses of those provinces.

Whereas Congress has superimposed the authority of its High Command, a sort of fascist dictatorship, over the working of the Congress ministries to prevent the healthy growth of parliamentary conventions and establishment of constitutional traditions, to deprive the Muslims of their due share and have refused to reconstitute ministries in consonance with the constitution, having due regard to the rights and interests of Muslims.

Whereas the Congress have decided:

(*a*) to enforce Vidya Mandir Scheme in the teeth of Muslim opposition;

(*b*) to foist the Bande Matram on Muslims and others as a national anthem in callous disregard of the feelings of Muslims who consider the song as not only idolatrous but it is in origin and conception a hymn of hatred to Muslims;

(*c*) to make Hindi with Devangiri script as the Lingua Franca of India in total defiance of the protests and wishes of the minorities with a view to inculcate Hindu religious ideas, philosophy and culture and establish dominance of Brahmanic culture in India;

(*d*) to introduce and enforce joint electorates in local

bodies with the strength of their majority and thus deprive Muslims of securing their true representation;

(*e*) to close Urdu Schools wherever possible and discourage the teaching of the Urdu language, and thus ultimately wipe it off;

(*f*) to suppress freedom of press and freedom of speech and legitimate action under the pretext of preventing incitement to violence and maintenance of law and order;

(*g*) to interfere with the age-long religious privileges and usages of the Muslim community by force of arm and resort to repressive measures.

Whereas the majority community of India has fostered and maintained since thousands of years a rigid caste system of theirs which is a negation of nationalism, equality, democracy and all the noble ideals that the modern world aspires to and stands for and which system has further superimposed social and economic inequalities upon a vast body of the people of this country and reduced millions of them to the position of irredeemable helots.

And whereas the evolution of a single united India and united Indian nation inspired by common aspirations and common ideals being impossible of realisation on account of the caste-ridden mentality and anti-Muslim policy of the majority community, and also on account of acute differences of religion, language, script, culture, social laws and outlook on life of the two major communities and even of race in certain parts.

This Conference considers it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment, and political self-determination of the two nations known as Hindus and Muslims, to recommend to All-India Muslim League to review and revise the entire question of what should be the suitable constitution for India which will secure honourable and legitimate status due to them, and that this Conference, therefore, recommends to the All-India Muslim League to devise a scheme of Constitution under which Muslims may attain full independence.

Further this Conference records its emphatic disapproval of the scheme of the All-India Federation as embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, and is opposed to its introduction and urges upon the British Government to refrain from its

enforcement as it considers the scheme to be detrimental to the interests of the people of India generally and those of the Muslims in particular.

That this conference further declares that no constitution by whomsoever framed will be acceptable to the Muslims of India unless it conforms to the principle enunciated above and is prepared in consultation with and accepted by the All-India Muslim League.

72

Report of the Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League to inquire into Muslim Grievances in the Congress Governed Provinces[1]

PART I

GENERAL SURVEY

The Communal Problem

The communal problem in India has long defied settlement. It has been approached by the responsible leaders of various communities and political parties from different angles, but each attempt to arrive at a final and satisfactory settlement has generally resulted in increased bitterness, because, during the pendency of negotiations, it is usually the first and foremost endeavour of each party to put the other in the wrong and throw upon it the whole blame for the failure of the peace parleys. The problem is so baffling that there is a tendency on the part of some of the leaders to adopt the ostrich-like policy of ignoring the problem altogether, or at least of deferring its solution till such time as India is "free". In our humble opinion, however, the problem is a real one and the sooner it is solved the better will it be for the country. To postpone its decision is simply to create a vicious circle: the communal problem can only be solved when India is free: India can only be free when the communal problem is solved. Such a circle can lead us nowhere and will only make the country a prey to any foreign exploiter.

Recently the minorities have been asked to think in terms of international politics and appeals have been made to present a united front to protect India against the perils involved in the

1. Raja Sayed Mohammed Mehdi of Pirpur was President of this Committee.

international situation. It has been deemed sufficient to assure the minorities in repeated resolutions, which have now assumed a monotonous formality, that their "language, culture and religion" will be protected and the minorities are expected to accept these assurances without any further safeguards. In our opinion this is a wholly incorrect approach of the problem. The communal problem remains unsettled not because of the communalism of the minorities, but because of the communalism of the majorities. In each province it is for the majority community to win the confidence of the minority, and this can only be done by deeds and not by words.

No one who is familiar with Indian affairs would deny the fact that the Congress has failed to inspire confidence in the minorities and has failed to carry them with it in spite of its oft-repeated resolution guaranteeing religious and cultural liberty to the various communities because its actions are not in conformity with its words. Consequently, though it has succeeded in bringing to its fold a few Muslims, Sikhs and Christians, the Congress continues to be a predominantly Hindu organization and the majority of its members, in spite of their pretensions to nationalism, are still imbued with narrow communalism.

Intoxicated with power after their success in the last general election, the leaders of the Congress initiated a closed-door policy by declaring that they were opposed to the formation of coalitions of alliances with any other party in the legislatures. The fact that separation and exclusiveness is not conducive to the evolution of a common national life was conveniently lost sight of in the hour of triumph.

We, in India, have been brought up in the traditions of the British Parliamentary democracy and the constitution foisted on us is also modelled, more or less, on the British pattern. There is, however, an essential difference between the body-politic of this country and that of Britain. The majority and minority parties in Britain are interchangeable; their complexion and strength go on changing with the conditions of the country. Today a National Government is in power, but the Conservative, Liberal and Labour parties have an equal chance of running the government of the country. Here, in India, we have a permanent Hindu majority and the other communities are condemned to the position of perpetual minority. Thus it is easy for the majority to assume a non-communal label and do things communal under the cloak of nationalism.

Any attempt to apply the Western principles of nationalism

without paying due regard to the peculiar conditions of the country is bound to confuse the issue. For the evolution of healthy nationalism and advancement of the country on the path of freedom, it is absolutely necessary that this problem, at once so important and so full of difficulties, should be dispassionately examined and clearly stated.

The Indian National Congress's conception of nationalism is based on the establishment of a national state of the majority community in which other nationalities and communities have only secondary rights. The Muslims think that no tyranny can be as great as the tyranny of the majority and they believe that only that state can be stable which gives equal rights and equal opportunities to all communities no matter how small. They attach great importance to this principle, which alone can safeguard the rights of the Muslims and other minorities. The Muslims have made it clear more than once that besides the question of religion, culture, language and personal laws, there is another question equally important for their future. They must secure definitely their political rights and their due share in the national life, government and administration of the country.

INDIAN ECONOMIC LIFE

Peculiar Characteristics

All serious students of the Indian problem will concede that the communal question of this country is quite different from the minority problems of other countries. Attempts are often made to take examples from foreign countries and to fasten them to Indian conditions but it is forgotten that there is no other country in the world where the curse of untouchability still prevails. Religious and linguistic differences, to a small extent, certainly do exist in other countries too, but nowhere do we find the caste system so rigid as it is today in India.

Varnasharam not only keeps other communities outside the fold of the Hindu community, but it also does not allow certain classes of Hindus themeselves to enjoy the same privileges as are enjoyed by the "twice-born" classes. There are certain vocations of life which can only be taken up by the depressed classes or the untouchables. The sanitary work in towns, cities and villages falls to their lot alone. They alone can dispose of the dead bodies of animals, work as scavengers and sweepers and perform other menial services. Even in the performance of religious and social functions they are not allowed the same rights and facilities as are enjoyed by the "twice-born" communities.

Such being the fate of some of those classes who, though worshipping different gods, rejoice to call themselves Hindus, the position of the Muslims, who differ from the majority community not only in their religious belief, but also cling to a different cultural outlook, can very well be understood and appreciated. This difference in outlook between the various communities not only separates them politically but also divides them economically.

It is true that people of different religions, castes and creeds are found in some trades, but such cases are rare. The Government services are open to all, but the undeniable fact remains that the caste of an individual determines his vocation in life. The various trades in the country are more or less monopolised by different castes. If an outsider tries to enter a certain profession, not generally open to his community, he meets with serious obstacles. He is opposed not on pure business principles: prejudices of religion and caste, more often than not, dictate the attitude of his rivals in trade towards him.

Business is thus divided into water-tight compartments. In commercial life careers are not open to talent. All communities have been affected by this system and it may safely be said that the effect of the division of economic life on the basis of caste has been so marked that in the majority of cases the religion, caste and community of a person can be inferred from his profession. Under these conditions it is even possible to damage trade interests of a particular community by enacting legislation on purely medical or sanitary grounds; and policies which, in other countries, would be purely economic, are, in India generally, based upon communalism. There have been numerous instances in which discriminatory taxation has been imposed on a certain commodity on apparently economic grounds, though the real motive has been purely communal.

Thus what may appear to a foreigner a purely economic question can be the source of real friction between communities. Religious passions of the ignorant masses can be excited on a question that on the face of it appears quite harmless.

In countries where professions are freely chosen and the commercial community consists of people joined together by common interests this possibility does not exist. But, as we have pointed out above, conditions in India are quite different. In other countries a taxation measure adopted by the legislature would equally affect all communities which constitute a certain trade or profession and its consequences can be termed national.

But in India the majority of people affected by a similar measure will belong to a particular community, caste or religion. Thus even an economic measure, which is national elsewhere, assumes a communal complexion in this country. It is easy for governments and local bodies to justify any discriminatory legislation by Western standards, to term it national and economic and to dismiss the just and reasonable protest of a particular community vitally affected by accusing it of narrow communalism. People who are not familiar with the conditions that subsist in this country can very easily be persuaded to condemn the protest of such a community against whose interests such measures are so cleverly conceived.

Congress leaders have declared in season and out of season that the Congress will always think in terms of the poor, but in the course of our inquiry it has been shown and proved to us that discrimination has been made in the case of Muslim peasants and workers by the Congress and Socialist organisations. Agents of zamindars and capitalists have been given communal colour to disputes that were purely economic. And once communal colour was given the poor victims of oppression were deprived of all protection from the very organisations which boast of nationalism.

The details of the incidents and atrocities committed in the village Tilkori, Hazaribagh district, Bihar, have become known to the public through newspaper reports and we need not recapitulate them in detail at this stage. We may, however, point out that only a short time before this incident there was a minor quarrel between a Congress volunteer and a Muslim landowner in the same district. Full inquiry was made into this incident and a huge public meeting was held and the occasion was thought fit for the visit of a Parliamentary Secretary. Strong protests were made and a big demonstration was staged.

The incident at Tilkori took place shortly afterwards. The victims were the poorest inhabitants of the village who graze the cattle of the well-to-do Brahamans and live on small plots of land let out to them in exchange for their services. There was no Muslim League organisation in the neighbourhood. The poor victims of the atrocities had to cover a distance of 40 miles on foot to reach the headquarters of the district from where some Muslim lawyers sent information to the headquarters of the Provincial Muslim League. On receiving the information, the Secretary of the League proceeded to the spot and made inquiries and issued his statement. One cannot help asking why

the local Congress organisation maintained complete silence during the eight days that elapsed between the incident and the arrival of the Secretary of the Muslim League and why no inquiry was instituted by the Congress or the Provincial Congress Government.

Then, in the village Seewan, in a sub-division of the Saran district in Behar, the houses of certain Muslims were set on fire. When Mr Abdul Ghani, M.L.A. arrived at the scene of the incident, some houses were still burning. This village happens to be near the village of Babu Rajendra Prasad, a former President of the Indian National Congress and a member of the Congress Working Committee. It is surprising, however, that no representative of the party, which claims to be a national organisation, came to the rescue of the sufferers and up till now no political organisation, except the Muslim League, seems to have taken any notice of the incident.

Then again, hundreds of workers of Rahli, Saugor district, Central Provinces, were turned out by the Bidi manufacturers for no other fault than voting for the candidate in whom they had confidence. It was a matter of principle and a narrow communal outlook should not have stood in the way of the vindication of the rights of the workers to use their vote freely. But no political or labour organisation, not even the much boasted Civil Liberties Union, came to the rescue of these helpless workers and not a voice of protest was raised against the tyranny of the Hindu Bidi manufacturers. These dismissed workers had to leave their homes and go to the cities of Saugor and Nagpur to earn their living.

Yet, in spite of these incidents, propaganda is carried on in and outside India that the Congress Ministries have restored civil liberty and the poorest peasant has felt the lifting of a great burden. There can be no doubt, at least so far as the Muslims are concerned, that civil liberty, though much advertised, does not exist. The tendency to show discrimination on communal grounds in rendering help and carrying on relief work among the oppressed and the poor is a unique feature of the Congress organisation of this country.

On the other hand, we are glad to note that during the Cawnpore labour strike, the District Muslim League there showed no distinction between Hindu and Muslim workers and helped everybody irrespective of his religious beliefs. The Cawnpore League distributed food and other necessities of life to the Hindu and Muslim workers with equal consideration.

Similarly, during the recent floods in the eastern districts of the United Provinces Muslim League volunteers in Bahraich, Gonda, Basti and other places rescued Hindus and Muslims alike, sometimes even at the risk of their own lives.

POLITICAL PARTIES

The growing tendency of political parties to become more and more communal is the chief danger to which democracy is exposed in India. In other countries, political parties are formed on such a basis that the majority and minority parties are interchangeable. Those who vote for Socialists today, can, if they feel dissatisfied, support the Nationalists or Conservatives tomorrow. The strength and following of various political parties vary according to the confidence they inspire among the people and to the extent they are able to fulfil their election pledges. Moreover, the success of a government is reflected in the popularity of its legislative measures and constant efforts are needed to maintain the majority.

In India, owing to the existence of a permanent religious majority, the complexion of political parties is quite different from those in other democracies. There is always a danger that a party, composed mainly of members of a particular community or followers of a particular religion may pass under the name of a Nationalist Party. Such a party is exposed to the temptation of raising the communal bogey in order to keep together its dissatisfied elements, who are too insistent on the fulfilment of election pledges, and thus to continue in perpetual majority.

Expectations were raised high by the promises made during the last general elections by the Congress to better the condition of the poor. The Muslims being the poorest community in India were the first to show disaffection towards the Congress because they felt that its economic programme was a mere camoulage to enlist their support at the elections and brought them no substantial relief. In any other country these poor classes could have gone over to the opposition without being dubbed communalists.

Speaking at the Students' Federation meeting at Calcutta Mr M.A. Jinnah stated that the League's fight was not against the Hindu community but against the Congress High Command. The Muslim League Party was allowed to coalesce with other progressive groups or parties whose ideals were nearly the same. This makes it clear that the aim of the Muslim League was not

to wage war against other cemmunities in India but to organise the Muslims and devote its energy to the solution of political and economic problems that face the country as a whole.

In order to work with other communities the programme of the Muslim League has to be such as would make it possible for other communities to cooperate with it. If the Party adopts an aggressive communal attitude it would be impossible to maintain harmony with other communities. Thus it is to the advantage of the Muslims to have a truly national and liberal programme so that others may cooperate with them. On the other hand, if the Muslim League chooses a narrow and communal policy, the Muslims will be condemned to perpetual minorities in almost all the provinces of India. They will be deprived of all opportunity of having, at any time, an effective voice in the administration of the country. Even in each of the two major Muslim Provinces—the Punjab and Bengal—it is not possible for the Muslims to have a majority without the cooperation of other communities. Thus it is clear that the Muslim League cannot afford to take up an aggressive communal attitude. But unfortunately responsible Congressmen and a section of the Press have made it their duty to misrepresent the views of the leaders of the Muslim League and its activities.

The attitude of the Congress, however, made it impossible for the League to cooperate with it in spite of the efforts of a number of League leaders to maintain cordial relations. The just and legitimate demands of the Muslims were regarded as an inconvenient feature of political life. Contemptuous offers were made to the leaders of the Muslim League. They were asked to liquidate the Muslim League Parliamentary Board, disband the League parties in the legislatures and to sign unconditionally the Congress pledge. To the patriotic Muslims such a course meant the denial of their right to organise themselves in order to maintain their separate identity and preserve their culture, and a complete surrender to the Party which, on its own admission, was mostly composed of Hindus and which had failed to win the confidence of the Muslim voters in the general election.

The Congress parties adopted the very methods for which they had hitherto condemned the British Government. Rival Muslim organisations were started and spoon-fed by Congress Cabinets and Committees. Attempts were made not only to disregard the true representatives of the Muslims, but a virulent campaign of vilification was started against the Muslim League and its leaders with the help of a few Muslims who signed the

Congress pledge. The temptation of office was held out to those who joined the Congress and a few Muslims, who had been returned to the Legislatures on the ticket of the Muslim League Parliamentary Board, were persuaded to sign the Congress pledge and were given places in the Ministries as representatives of the Muslim masses.

It has been alleged that the cry of "Islam in Danger" was raised and the name of God was used by the League to secure votes. But the very party which has so vehemently made all these allegations felt doubts about the efficacy of its political and economic programme and adopted the same methods for which it condemned the Muslim League. As a matter of fact the Muslim Ulema working for the Congress dragged in religion to enlist support for the Congress candidates. In the Bijnor bye-election the Congress Muslim workers were dressed in the green Islamic colour, carried the Islamic flag with the Crescent and Star and raised the cry of "Allah-o-Akbar" at their meetings. The Muslim League, on the other hand, never depended on the Ulema for its success. It was not the League that raised the cry of "Islam in Danger". It has been put into its mouth by its opponents. Every Muslim believes that Islam can never be in danger.

Again, it has been stated by responsible Congress leaders that because during the bye-elections the Muslim League candidates were standing on communal tickets, the Hindu zamindars, bankers and lawyers, who had so far opposed the Congress, preferred a Congress candidate. We are further told that the action of these people was not due to communalism but was a reaction to communalism. This statement is falsified by the recent event at Fyzabad. In the bye-election for the Fyzabad General Constituency, though the Muslim League adopted a policy of indifference, certain Muslim zamindars and others were found supporting the Mahasabha candidates who possessed a much wider appeal. On the Congress platform too, side by side with Congress leaders of repute, were seen persons who were noted for their narrow communalism. One of these speakers had only been recently convicted for spreading communal hatred and had been released on bail pending appeal. We wonder if the average voter was given the fullest opportunity to distinguish between the Mahasabha candidate, standing on a purely communal ticket, and the Congress candidate, who stood on a "non-communal" ticket.

In Bihar instances were brought to our notice of speeches

tending to provoke communal feelings being made even at meetings attended by Parliamentary Secretaries and responsible Congressmen. Similarly, in the Central Provinces instances have been reported which go to substantiate the theory that there is something like identity of purpose between the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha. A person can be a member of the Congress and the Mahasabha at the same time, but this privilege is not extended to the Institution that represents the interests of a minority. When K.S. Abdur Rahman pointed out an occasion when even Congress Ministers participated in the reception of the President of the Mahasabha and drew attention to the enthusiasm shown by Congressmen all over the Province at his receptions, Dr Khare replied that he was present at one of the meetings and that Congressmen had gone there in their individual capacity. Technically, Dr Khare was right, but one has to consider the impression that his conduct created in the mind of the man in the street, who must have read in it a complete identification between the so-called communal organisation of the Mahasabha, and the oft-proclaimed "national" institution of the Congress.

Popular imagination looks more to things that happen and gives them its own meaning and interpretation. Whatever may be the underlying principle of Congress nationalism and whatever may be the justification for the foregoing incidents, the fact remains that the average Hindu is inclined to associate Swaraj with Ram Raj and Congress Government with Hindu Government. The Muslims feel that, notwithstanding the non-communal professions of the Congress and the desire of a few Congressmen to follow a truly national policy, a vast majority of the Congress members are Hindus who look forward, after many centuries of British and Muslim rule, to the re-establishment of purely Hindu Raj.

MUSLIM MASS CONTACT MOVEMENT

Its Repercussions

The last provincial election brought home to the Congress High Command the fact that the prestige of the Congress as a national organisation was in danger. The decision of the Congress was not to contest elections in Muslim constituencies generally and the overwhelming defeats of its Muslim candidates in the very few elections that it contested completely exposed the hollowness of its pretensions to represent the Muslim masses.

The significance of the Congress defeats becomes more pronounced in view of the fact that the Congress possessed an unparalleled and a most powerful organisation in the country and that no Muslim party was in a position effectively to offer any strong opposition to it. The statement of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on the defeats of the Congress candidates in the general election clearly shows that the Congress leadership was greatly alarmed at the opposition. But unfortunately, instead of trying to find out the real cause of this anti-pathy, the Congress High Command launched the Muslim Mass Contact Movement.

There are many Muslims who firmly believe that the Congress by this movement is trying to destroy Muslim solidarity and create disruption in the community. A number of Muslim workers have been employed to fight their co-religionists by a political party which is predominantly Hindu. Concerted efforts are being made not only to induce Muslims to join the Congress, but also to bring into disrepute the Muslim League.

It has been claimed that the Mass Contact Movement has been in existence for many years and only took a more definite shape at the Lucknow Congress of 1937. It has also been claimed that the movement had never been designed in terms of Muslims only nor was it merely confined to them.

To understand this movement properly, the methods employed by its promoters must be taken into consideration as well as its effect on the minority community.

Whatever be the idea behind this movement, it remains an undisputed fact that after the general election Mass Contact was carried on amongst the Muslim masses alone. We have not heard of the religious heads of other minorities working on behalf of the Congress to bring their co-religionists into its fold.

It has been asserted that only such Ulema as had associated with the Congress and were its old friends were asked to support the Congress candidates in the bye-elections. Besides, the candidates particularly asked for the support of such men. We think that the argument put forward by an eminent leader of the Congress fully brings to light one fact. We all know that though Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in his bye-election speeches, emphasised economic problems, the candidates themselves were not confident of the efficacy of this programme of the Congress in enlisting the support of the Muslim electors.

The activities of these Congress Ulema are not confined to

those enumerated by the Congress leaders. Recently, just after a communal outbreak had occurred in Pilibhit, Seth Damodar Dass, accompanied by two Maulanas, visited the locality, and issued a statement throwing the responsibility for the trouble on the Muslim League, which on inquiry proved to be unfounded. This fact throws some light on the use which is made of some of these learned theologians and also why so much importance is given to these old friends. We wonder if the majority of such persons could have a place in any self-respecting organisation. We can now understand the reluctance of the Congress to recognise the Muslim League as the sole representative of the Muslims for this would deprive it of such convenient tools as the Ulema who went to Pilibhit with the Bareilly Congress President.

The Congress secured overwhelming majorities in five provinces and a working majority in the sixth as the result of the first general election held under the new reforms. The attention of the whole of India was focussed on the Congress and its decision on acceptance of office was eagerly awaited. Everyone believed that a new era would set in with the acceptance of office by the Congress. It was generally taken for granted by progressive Muslims that the gulf that had existed so long between the various communities in India would be bridged once for all, that the differences, for which an alien government had been held responsible so far, would disappear and that all progressive national elements, whose political ideals were similar, would be brought together for the service of the Motherland, and would work a common programme for the freedom of the country.

It was at this moment that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Congress President, launched the Muslim Mass Contact programme in right earnest. It was pointed out to the Muslims that the real fight was for bread and butter and there was no sense in their keeping aloof under the banner of the Muslim League. But, as we have pointed out in an earlier chapter, even economics in India is communal. Urdu newspapers were started to carry on Congress propaganda among the Muslims and every attempt was made to win over the Muslims. A campaign of vilification against Muslim League leaders, specially Mr Jinnah, formed a part of this movement. An attempt was also made to set up a rival organisation to the All-India Muslim League under the name "Azad Muslim League". It was further declared that the Congress, in view of its principles of nationalism, could not enter into an alliance with any communal

organisation, however national may be the latter's policy and programme. Since then, however, we have seen how this declaration has been stretched to make it possible for the Congress to form ministries in the Frontier and Assam as it suited the interests of the majority community.

It was but natural for patriotic Muslims to feel aggrieved at the attitude taken up by the Congress High Command. The change in the attitude of the Congress leaders, specially those of the United Provinces, was simply a revelation. Though the Mass Contact Movement was on the programme of the Congress no one heard about it until the general election was over and Congress majorities were assured. Even then the Congress leaders, who made and unmade Cabinets and who appointed and dismissed Ministers, avoided the Muslim masses and employed Maulvis to convert the Muslim masses to the Congress creed. The Maulvis, having no voice in the moulding of the Congress policy and programme, naturally could not promise to solve the real difficulties of the masses, a promise which would have drawn the masses towards the Congress. The Maulvis and others employed for the work adopted the line of least resistance by creating a division among the Muslim masses by carrying on a most unworthy propaganda against the leaders of the Muslim League. Under these circumstances it was but natural for the Muslims to conclude that this movement was directed only to lure the Muslims into the Congress fold and a policy of "divide and rule" was being followed by the Congress to avoid a settlement with the Muslim community on the real issues.

It will not be out of place here to point out that in other countries where political situations are complicated by religious and racial differences, no political party would think of adopting such methods of propaganda as would lead to emphasise the religious differences between various communities. In Great Britain when the question of Irish Home Rule was put in the forefront of the Liberal Party's programme by Gladstone, in spite of a split in the Party itself, no mass contact movement was started to bring the Protestants of Ulster into the fold of the Liberal Party. Discrimination on a communal basis is the last thing to be undertaken by a party which forms the Government.

The Congress Governments should give the right lead to the country. They should attempt to work on the principles of true nationalism and gain the confidence of the minorities by

removing all their suspicions. It was the failure of the Congress in this respect which, together with the correct lead given by the Muslim League and its policy and programme helped to make the League, in such a short time, such a powerful and representative organisation of the Muslims of India.

PART II

THE CONFLICT

And Its Causes

GENERAL POLICY OF THE CONGRESS

With the acceptance of office the Congress found itself in circumstances which were not dissimilar to those which face belligerent nations after an armistice. We all remember how after the Great War different countries faced this problem. The success and stability of each government depended upon the measure of success with which this problem was tackled. Work had to be found for disbanded soldiers and gigantic efforts were needed on the part of the governments to turn the warlike energies of the nations into peaceful pursuits of trade and industry.

When the Congress Governments were formed direct conflict with the British Government ceased. The chief objective, which had so far brought together the different elements within the Congress fold, was lost sight of in the general scramble for power and the ideal for which the people had worked since 1920 was abandoned, at least temporarily. The course of true statesmanship for the Congress Cabinets lay in creating a calm and peaceful atmosphere and class wars and defiance of lawful authority were the last things to be encouraged at the juncture.

Unfortunately these were the things which were encouraged most. The authority of the police and other governmental agencies, which were so far responsible for the maintenance of law and order, was defied. People of a particular community were encouraged to believe that the government was now theirs. Instances of intimidation and defiance of lawful authority increased in number every day.

A section of responsible leaders created the impression that every member of the Congress enjoyed a privileged position and every Congressman became conscious of the fact that by virtue of belonging to the party in power he could influence the administrative machinery. Several Muslim speakers drew pointed

attention to this state of affairs in their speeches on the adjournment motion in the U.P. Legislative Assembly on the communal disturbances. They stated that great mischief had been done by the Chief Secretary's circular asking the District Officers to consult the local Congress Committees. This had resulted in the demoralisation of the local officials, who could not take up an independent attitude on delicate matters. Congressmen had taken up the position of non-official advisers to local officials and selfish people utilised the situation for their own benefit and for mischievous ends.

People were encouraged to do what they liked and to say whatever they wanted. Respect for lawful authority was undermined. In the communique issued by the Governor of the U.P. at the time of the resignation of the Cabinet over the question of the release of political prisoners, reference was made to the disturbing nature of the activities of some of these men. It was pointed out that the release of prisoners had been made an occasion for widespread demonstrations of a revolutionary character which had created a great impression on the public mind. We think that if similar situations had occurred in other provinces as well we would have been able to quote many more pieces of evidence from such impartial sources.

The privileged position which the Congress workers enjoy and the way in which partiality is shown to them has been made clear in the remarks of the Judges of the Oudh Chief Court in the Hearsay case in which a Congress worker was one of the parties. Their Lordships felt compelled to point out that the filing of the appeal by the Government with no judicial justification who bouud to create the impression that the fact that the complainant was the President of the local Congress Committee had something to do with it.

The way in which members of the Congress Party have interfered in the day-to-day administration of justice has also been dealt with in several judgments of the Allahabad High Court. In the Contempt of Court case against Dr Vishwanath Mukerji, a Congress M.L.A. from Gorakhpur, Their Lordships observed:

"We have reason to believe that a large number of communications have been addressed to courts in this Province during the last month by persons on behalf of parties to cases and others interested in such cases. The two cases which we have just decided are the first of this class and having regard to the attitude adopted by Dr Mukerji, we felt able to take a lenient view of these offences. . . . . It must be made clear to every one

that this Court will not tolerate any attempt to bring pressure upon a judicial officer and particularly upon junior judicial officers who are not in a position to defend themselves. We have taken a lenient view of this case and we trust that such lenieney will not be misunderstood."

We have received numerous complaints, supported by evidence, from Muslims that they have been bullied by local Congress organisations and have found it difficult to get even-handed justice. A sort of parallel government is being run by Congressmen. Wherever the police makes inquiries the local Congress organisation also starts its own independent investigations. The atmosphere is no longer congenial to the pursuit of ordinary vocations of life with freedom.

In spite of all this. prominent Congress leaders lose no opportunity of repeating that one of the first acts of the Congress Cabinets was to restore the civil liberty of the people. We should like to know if this civil liberty is only meant for the members of the majority community.

In the succeeding chapters we discuss the various causes of conflict between the two major communities in India and how they have been aggravated by the short-sighted policies of Congress Governments.

BANDE MATRAM

It was as a result of the intense resentment among the Muslim masses that the All-India Muslim League passed the following resolution on the Bande Matram issue at its Lucknow session:

"This meeting of the All-India Muslim League strongly condemns the attitude of the Congress in foisting Bande Matram as the national anthem upon the country in callous disregard of the feelings of Muslims and considers this song not merely positively anti-Islamic and idolatrous in its inspiration and ideas, but definitely subversive of the growth of genuine nationalism in India.

"This meeting further calls upon the Muslim members of the various Legislatures and public bodies in the country not to associate themselves in any manner with the highly objectionable song."

The Congress Working Committee issued a lengthy statement on the song in October 1937 and ultimately decided to recommend that certain stanzas, which contained allegorical references, may not be used on the national platform. It is

further claimed that the two stanzas recommended as the National Song do not contain a word or phrase that will offend anybody.

By excluding certain lines from the "National Song" the Congress High Command has conceded the League's contention that Bande Matram at least does contain objectionable passages. They must, however, realise that the Muslims cannot forget the historical background of the song and the sentiments which led to its composition.

Further, in support of the song it is stated that Bande Matram has been associated with Indian nationalism for more than thirty years and numerous associations of sentiments and sacrifices have gathered round it and that no objection was taken to it, except on political grounds, by the Government. To our mind the defence exposes the narrow and predominantly communal nature of the nationalism proclaimed by the Congress. The fact that the British Government objected to the song on merely political grounds only goes to prove the League's contention that the religious import of the song is directed against the Muslims alone.

We cannot help wondering that if popular songs are not made to order and cannot be successfully imposed, why, since the acceptance of office by the Congress, Bande Matram is being thrust upon the impressionable hoys in schools. We may here point out that before the acceptance of office by the Congress this song was recited at meetings held under the aegis of the Congress and those who attended them were there out of their own free will. As such there was no occasion for objection. But now the position has changed. The Congress now forms the Government in seven provinces of India. Congressmen and their sympathisers have started singing the song at public meetings and other functions where members of different religions have to be present.

Moreover, the various Congress Governments have lifted the ban on the song in Gevernment schools. The reason given was that since the ban was imposed by the Government of the pre-Reform days and was directed against Indian nationalism it had to be lifted. The effect of this order has been, however, quite different. School teachers, keen on winning the favour of the new matters, have taken it upon themselves to make the singing of Bande Matram a permanent feature of the school curriculum. To mention only a few examples, the Muslim students of Patna objected to the singing of the song and went on strike,

The school management compelled some of the students to leave the school. The Muslim public of Patna had to open a separate school to save the careers of these boys from being totally ruined. Then in the Central Provinces the Muslim students have the same grievance against the Municipal schools. In the Normal School at Wardha the Muslim students are not allowed to touch the food in the school mess, are forced to stand with folded hands when Bande Matram is sung and made to live entirely on vegetarian diet. All this only shows a callous disregard of the feelings and sentiments of the Muslims by the Congress Governments.

THE TRICOLOUR

The Muslims believe that the tricolour of the Congress is purely a party flag and nothing more. Every political party, whether in office or in the opposition, has the right to hoist its flag wherever it likes. While on most of the Municipal and District Board buildings the Congress flag has been hoisted without any opposition from the Muslims, whenever any local body, with a Muslim majority, has passed a resolution for the hoisting of the Muslim League flag, the members of the majority community, confident of the Congress Government's support, have put obstacles in the way of the resolution being enforced. It has been claimed by them that their objection to the League flag is based on the fact that it is a communal flag. We should like to know if the hoisting of the so-called national flag on the unwilling minorities is anything but an expression of the narrow communalism of the majority community.

It is argued on behalf of the Congress that the tricolour contains the Muslim green. But without a change of heart, without a settlement of the points in dispute and without unity of purpose between the two communities the inclusion of the Muslim colour in the Congress flag is meaningless. The flag should represent the true feelings and sentiments of the Muslim community if it is to have any significance at all, but unfortunately it does not.

Since the Congress has come into power the hoisting of the tricolour over public buildings has become another source of friction between the two communities. There have been instances where the flag has been hoisted without the sanction of the proper authority. We may, however, point out that a national flag cannot be forced upon unwilling people any more than a national anthem. Such attempts would only expose the latent communal nature of the "national" policy of the party, which is overwhelmingly Hindu.

EXCLUSION OF MUSLIMS FROM LOCAL BODIES AND DEBT CONCILIATION BOARDS

The Muslims have found it almost impossible to get into the local bodies or into the Debt Conciliation Boards in the provinces with joint electorate. In Bihar the Muslims had to boycott the elections to the local bodies so long as their grievances were not redressed. In the C.P. and Berar, where the Muslims form a very small minority, they have been excluded from local bodies. It was pointed out to us that the Muslims were better treated by the Independent Party than they are now by the Congress. Before the advent of the Congress Government there used to be at least one Muslim on each Debt Conciliation Board, but now there are several boards with no Muslim representation. We may further add that an overwhelming majority of the Muslims in this province belongs to the class of labourers or small cultivators, who are heavily indebted to the rich money-lenders and as such their cases require special attention. We have dealt with this question fully in Part III of this Report.

We may, however, state that even the operation of measures, designed apparently to promote public welfare, irrespective of class or community, is so manipulated as to exclude the minorities, specially the Muslims, from their benefits.

COW PROTECTION

The question of cow slaughter has been one of the causes of conflict between the Hindus and Muslims of India. With the taking over of the reins of government in the seven provinces by the Congress the question of cow protection has assumed great importance and propaganda has been carried on with redoubled energy in this connection. There have been numerous instances where Muslims have been intimidated to give up cow sacrifice and the eating of beef. Organised picketing has been done to prevent the sale of cows to Muslims. The dastardly attack on Muslim butchers at the Dadri Fair in the Ballia district U.P., was only one of the many cases where force has been used. The details of communal outbreaks and their origin are given in a later chapter. Here we are only concerned with the question of cow protection.

While the country was seething with communal troubles people looked to the Haripura Congress to relieve the tension in the country. Unfortunately, however, the speeches of the most eminent Congress leaders on the occasion of the opening of the Cow Exhibition were far from reassuring. Mahatma

Gandhi, referring to the importance of cow protecti on said:

"From the historical and economic point of view the cow must be protected. Unfortunately we have not taken cow protection seriously. Due to our carelessness, idleness and ignorance, good breeds of cows are now vanishing. In the olden days the Rajas earned the title of "Gopalas" meaning cow protectors. At present nothing is done to protect cow and consequently they are proving a burden on the economic life. It was not true that cows were costly to maintain." The Mahatma further appealed to all to drink more cow's milk, for if the nation determined to drink cow's milk then cows could be saved. He urged the people to understand the real significance of cow protection.

Sardar Vallabhai Patel, in requesting the Mahatma to open the Exhibition, said that the idea of cow protection had come from the Mahatma himself. Mahatma Ghandhi was the pioneer of two things, the *charkha* and cow protection.

We have referred to these two speeches as they produced a profound impression throughout the country and there were significant reactions to them. The economic plea for cow protection was taken up by Mr Chitervadis, a Mahasabhaite M.L.A. of the C.P., in the statement of the aims and objects of his Cow Protection Bill, which imposes heavy restrictions regarding slaughter of animals even for social and religious purposes. This is in keeping with the line taken up by the Congress leaders at Haripura. It is also interesting to remember that the *charkha* has so far been considered as a sure means of bringing independence to India. Now that it has been coupled with cow protection, the ideal of independence has only been brought closer with the religious and communal ideal of the Hindu community. This is not surprising when we remember that Mahatma Gandhi's fundamental motives are religious and he has repeatedly declared that his object in life is to bring religion into politics. Moreover, the Mahatma's religion is based on the fundamental Hindu scripture, the Bhagwat Gita.

It is needless for us to point out that the people have been repeatedly told that Swaraj has set in with the acceptance of office by the Congress. And once the people start believing that they are the real rulers of their country, it is but natural for the members of the majority community to cherish the title of Gopalas, specially when they have been exhorted to do so by their greatest leader.

Unfortunately, this false propaganda has only resulted in increased communal tension throughout the country. The population in villages and towns throughout India is now divided between those who drink cow's milk and those who are unwilling to change their diet. We wonder if the Muslims and other minorities are regarded as part of the nation which has been asked to drink cow's milk. Anyway, licences for cow slaughter have been withheld in several municipalities of the Central Provinces. Such attempts at putting a stop to cow slaughter have generally been made at places where the Muslims are numerically weak or disorganised.

COMMUNAL RIOTS

Cause and Origin

Communal riots have unfortunately become more freequent in the Congress provinces and they have been largely the natural outcome of the disregard for law and order and disrespect for life and property preached by irresponsible Congressmen. It is a lamentable fact that not only have the occasions when communal tension has resulted in violent outbreaks increased to an extent hitherto unknown, but fresh causes of friction have arisen as a result of the policy adopted by the Congress Governments.

In giving an account of the nature of disputes between the two communities we cannot do better than describe the various viewpoints that have been put forward by the leaders of the two communities and the discussion in the Legislatures of the United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces and Orissa.

In reply to a question the Premier of Bihar said that orders had been issued against the Muslims in sixteen places in connection with Muharram, Bakr-Id and Holi festivals. Some of the speakers, justifying the Government's action, went even so far as to maintain that non-violence was the accepted creed of the Congress Party and that orders under Section 144, Cr. P. C. were issued to avoid violence. Thus the creed of non-violence, to carry the argument to its logical conclusion which had been so far employed against the British bureaucracy, was not to be employed to deprive the minority community of its civil rights. The Government defended the promulgation of such orders on the grounds of avoiding a breach of peace. It was further stated that the period of these orders was extended to give the parties a chance to obtain an injunction from Civil Courts. On the other hand, in Zahidabad (Gorakhpur), where the Muslims had already secu red a decree from the Civil Court recognising their

right of cow sacrifice, orders under Section 144, Cr. P. C. were issued, according to the U.P. Premier, to avoid a breach of peace.

The Karachi Congress resolution on the fundamental rights of minorities only gurantees them their rights so far as observance does not lead to breach of peace. Thus it is only natural that this provision should be utilised by the Congress Ministers to deprive the Muslims of their civil rights.

In the United Provinces Legislative Assembly several attempts were made to fix the responsibility for riots on the Muslims. The Minister of Education, Mr Sampurnanand, is reported to have said that the minority community thought that it could bring the Congress Government to their knees by creating communal disturbances. He, however, admitted that in his home own town, Benares, the riots started with a clash between two parties of Holi processionists in which one Hindu was killed. We fail to understand why with his Benares experience the Minister indulged in such a generalisation. This disorderly behaviour of Holi processionists could, by no stretch of imagination, be connected with the activities of the minority community.

Then the Minister of Justice, Dr K.N. Katju, maintained that irresponsible statements of members of the Muslim League and a campaign of vilification of the Government in the Urdu Press was responsible for the riots and that the minority community, taking advantage of the Government's solicitude for the freedom of the Press and speech, wanted to bully them. The Minister of Justice should have been better informed, at least of the happenings in his own town Allahabad. The Magistrate, in delivering judgment in one of the riot cases at Allahabad, observed: "It is the Hindus who set the ball rolling."

We cannot believe that a "campaign of lies" in the Urdu Press could have influenced those people against whom the above remark of the Magistrate was made.

The U.P. Premier, Mr G.B. Pant, was of the opinion that the objectionable propaganda of the Muslim League and the determination of the Opposition to embarrass the Government was responsible for the riots. It is the duty of the Government to maintain law and order and to protect the lives and property of the citizens. In all democratic countries the Opposition criticises the Government and yet no Government has

tried to explain away its failure by accusing the Opposition of "embarrassing the Government".

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, referring to the riots, is reported to have said: "Why were there riots this year? It was because the Congress Ministry was in power."

At a meeting of the Unity Board at Allahabad Mr Badri Prasad, Secretary of the Hindu Mahasabha, stated: "These riots were created by some organisation to lower the growing strength of the Congress."

To our mind all these speeches fail to get at the root of the problem by throwing the blame on the Opposition. We believe that the trouble was due to the preaching of the ideals of a party in the name of nationalism and forcing them on everybody.

The Muslims knew that they were powerless and all that they could do was to adopt a policy of self-preservation based on peaceful relations with the majority community. It was the failure of the Congress Governments which largely depended on the support of the Hindu members to take strong measures against Hindu aggressive elements that resulted in the crop of communal disturbances all over the country.

THE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

The question of language and culture has assumed great importance recently due to confused thinking among some of the prominent Congress leaders who refuse to acknowledge the very existence of a separate Muslim culture in India. The word "Culture" has a wide significance and covers the entire activity of man—intellectual, aesthetic, spiritual, moral, social, economic and political; for, the true seat of culture or its main spring is the mind of man; and as is the mind, so its manifestations which constitute its culture. This definition itself should convince those who deny the existence of a separate Muslim culture. This is, however, not a place to enter into a detailed discussion on Muslim culture and we will confine ourselves to the practical problem that faces the country.

We may point out that the Urdu language came into existence as the result of an attempt to take a purely Aryan language and turn it into a common language so that both Hindus and Muslims may understand each other. It is not a purely Muslim language as the modern champions of Hindustani would have us believe nor it is spoken or understood in

Islamic countries. The Muslims who came to India spoke either Persian or Arabic. There was no reason why they should have adopted an entirely new language if it was not for the purpose of having a common language with the inhabitants of the country. Urdu is thus the *lingua franca* of India—the great binder of different peoples.

Urdu was built up by the contributions of both Hindus and Muslims. The former have done as much to make it the common language of the country as the latter. If we find, Khusrau, Ghalib, Mir and Akbar Allahabadi among the Muslim giants of Urdu literature, we have also Pandit Ratan Nath Sarshar and Pandit Daya Shanker Naseem from amongst the Hindus. Even among the living men there is no one who is more keen on preserving the Urdu language than Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, a great scholar of Urdu.

It is thus clear that Muslims, far from being opposed to the evolution of a common language for the country, were in fact the first to realise its necessity and have done their best to evolve one. Unfortunately, however, the communal tension, which made its first appearance in the country in the beginning of this century, also affected the question of language, and Urdu, which had so far been accepted as the *lingua franca* of the country, was dubbed as the language of the Muslims alone.

We may further point out that the Muslims, having decided to have Urdu as their mother tongue, took to the language in right earnest and their entire literature, including all branches of knowledge, has been built up in this language. As such they attach great importance to the preservation of Urdu as written in the Persian script and would stoutly resist all attempts to destroy it.

The question of language has drawn the attention of the Congress leaders a great deal and various pronouncements have been made by them. The interpretations given to the term Hindustani by these leaders not only vary a great deal but amply show that there is no unity of thought even among those who direct the policy of the Congress.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad in his letter to the Congress Premiers declared that so far as the problem of language and script was concerned, a controversy arose in the United Provinces and Bihar as far back as 1902. As a consequence new meanings were attached to words which were previously used for the same language. The term Urdu was said to refer to that form of the Hindustani language which was written in the Persian script and

the term Hindi was applied to the same language written in the Deva Nagri script. The Indian National Congress, the Maulana further pointed out, definitely ended the controversy thirteen years ago under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi. The Congress decided that for the national inter-provincial language the same form of Hindustani should be used as had been in use since the 17th century. Thus there was no place for any doubt so far as the fundamental question of common language was concerned. The Congress Ministries in the various provinces, according to the Maulana, were acting upto the principle laid down by the Congress. He, however, admitted that in certain provinces people could not discriminate between the new connotations of Hindi and Hindustani and whenever they used the word Hindustani only they unintentionally came nearer the zone of controversy.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, dealing with the same question, stated that the Congress guaranteed the language and culture of the minorities in India. He wanted to encourage all the great provincial languages of the country and at the same time wanted to make Hindustani, as written both in Deva Nagri and Persian scripts, the national language. Both scripts were to be officially recognised and the choice of their use was to be left to the people. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also gave an assurance that this policy was being followed by the various Congress Ministries.

Mahatma Gandhi first endorsed the views of the U.P. Minister of Education, Mr Sampurnanand, that for technical and scientific terms increasing use of the Sanskrit language should be made to supplement Hindustani. He followed it up by an article in the Harijan in which he stated: "So far as the Congress is concerned, Hindustani is its recognised official language designed as an all-India language for inter-provincial contact. It is not to supplant but to supplement provincial languages . . . . For the purpose of crystallising Hindustani, Hindi and Urdu may be regarded as feeders. A Congressman must, therefore, wish well to both and keep in touch with both forms as far as he can. This Hindustani will have many synonyms to supply the varied requirements of a growing nation rich in provincial languages. Hindustani spoken to a Bengali or to Southern audiences will naturally have a large stock of words of Sanskrit origin. The same speech delivered in the Punjab will have a large admixture of words of Arabic and Persian origin. Similar will be the case with audiences composed predominantly of Muslims, who cannot understand many words of Sanskrit origin".

We think that these assurances do not go far and instead of allaying the fears of the Muslims they have only aggravated them.

The real issue has been lost sight of. The controversy referred to by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad has resulted in the accumulation of a vast literature in both Hindi and Urdu in which increasing use of Sanskrit and Arabic and Persian words has been made by the writers of Hindi and Urdu respectively. Thus the Maulana's definition has no application to the language as written and spoken today. In fact, Hindustani is actually a non-existent language. It only exists in the minds of the Congress leaders. The living languages are Urdu and Hindi. The mere fact that a book, which is full of Sanskrit words, is published in Persian script does not make it any more intelligible to Muslims that if it were published in Deva Nagri script.

We are surprised at the supporters of Sanskrit advocating the use of a dead language, as no doubt Sanskrit is, for supplying technical and scientific terms to the future common language of the country. Mahtama Gandhi seems to disagree with the definition of Hindustani provided by Maulana Azad, who thinks that the difference between Urdu and Hindi is only that of script and the two are really one. Further, if the question of script was not taken into account both languages would become Hindustani. The Mahatma, on the other hand, points out that Urdu and Hindi should be regarded as feeders for Hindustani, which is to supplement and not to supplant the provincial languages. Moreover, we doubt if his instructions about the use of Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian words according to the varying circumstances would be conducive to the evolution of a *lingua franca*. We think that such a language, if it is evolved at all, would fail to serve the very purpose for which it is meant. It will fail to bring the various people of India together by the ties of a common language.

Another subject allied with the question of common language, is the question of classical literature. The speech of the Minister of Education, Bihar, throws ample light on the subject. Oppening the proceedings of the Text Book Committee, he declared that the soul of India was awakened once again and was crying for self-expression, self-realisation and self-fulfilment. He added that she would achieve none of these until she found the mould and channel, the medium and setting, the tradition and background in which Kabir, Rahman, Nanak and Tulsidas thought and taught and sang and prayed. We need hardly point out how narrow and one-sided a view of Indian cultural background has been taken by the Minister of Education. He forgets the very existence of Khusrau, Ghalib and Mir and the part played by them in moulding the culture of the country. We are further at a loss to understand how the temporal character of

education is to be maintained with the inclusion of prayers. The foregoing remarks of the Minister give us an indication of what the cultural background is going to be and the wide gulf that separates the innocent looking resolutions passed by the Congress and the actual practice enunciated by no less a person than a responsible Minister of Education in a Congress Government.

The contributions of writers and thinkers of all communities should build up the national language and culture of the country. But if an attempt is made to introduce text-books and use officially a language which represents only the ideas, thoughts and sentiments of a particular community, the mere use of the Persian script will not change the communal nature of the language.

Mahatma Gandhi, writing on the tyranny of the English language in the Harijan, said: "The medium of a foreign language through which higher education has been imparted has caused incalculable intellectual and moral injury to the nation. The tyranny of English has been so great that even Sanskrit and Persian have to be learnt through English. I know what time I took to learn arithmetic, geometry, etc. I should have learnt them easily in one year if I had not to learn them through English but Gujrati and my grasp of the subjects would have been easier and clearer. I would have made use of such knowledge in my home. This English medium created an unpassable barrier between me and the members of my family who had not gone to an English school. I was fast becoming a stranger to my own home."

We may point out that Muslim boys and girls will suffer from all these disabilities, which have been so vividly described by Mahatma Gandhi, if the present attempts of Congress Ministers to impart education to them in the vernaculars of the various provinces are continued. An overwhelming majority of Muslims of India speak and read Urdu and that is their mother tongue. The Muslims of these minority provinces further point out that if their children are forced to receive education through the medium of a vernacular which is not their mother tongue, not only cultural degeneration will set in among them but they will also be placed at a disadvantage in competition with the boys of other communities, who are fortunate enough to receive their education in their own mother tongue.

The Muslims in Orissa and Maharatti-speaking districts of the Central Provinces and Berar look with alarm at the proposal of introducing Oriya and Maharatti as mediums of instructions without including Urdu as one of the media. They point out that

a Muslim will have to learn Oriya, Maharatti or any other vernacular, as the case may be, in addition to English and Urdu, his own mother tongue. Complaints were also made to us of the unwillingness of Government and local bodies to open Urdu schools where the number of Muslim boys of school-going age justified the existence of such schools. In Malabar, of the 73 schools declared uneconomic by the Standing Committee of the District Board and recommended for abolition 58 are Moplah Muslim Schools. Moreover, most of the special facilities provided to the Moplahs by the previous government to encourage education among them have been withdrawn by the Congress Government. Then districts like Saugor and Mandla in C.P. with a substantial Muslim population have no Urdu school. In Hinganghat Middle School all teaching is done in Maharatti both in primary and upper classes. Applications written in Urdu are rejected by the municipal boards in the Central Provinces and Berar. Then, the text books prescribed at present for study deal exclusively with the glories of Hindu divinities and Hindu heroes and saints; and contain no reference to the cultural or social achievements of the Muslim or to any historic names held in veneration by them. The grievance of the Muslims is not that these text books deal with Hindu heroes or Hindu great men, but that they do not speak of the Muslims at all. This is not a way to evolve a single nationality and build up a common culture.

Then in Bihar, although the use of Urdu script is allowed, the courts usually insist on presentation of a copy written in the Hindi script. In the Legislative Assembly of C.P. and Berar the speeches of members who speak Urdu are reported either in Hindi script or only a summary of their speeches is reported in English.

The foregoing are some of the examples of the methods employed to suppress Urdu in provinces where the Congress is in power.

It may not be out of place here to state briefly certain principles which have been applied to the solution of the language problem in Switzerland. Out of a total population of about three millions there are about 7,00,000 French, about 2,00,000 Italians and the rest Germans. There are 22 cantons of which only three are fully French-speaking, three-half French and half German-speaking and one is Italian-speaking and 15 are German-speaking cantons. The Italians do not form more than six per cent. of the total population, yet the Italian-speaking minority has got the same facilities for receiving education, and

shares all the advantages with the rest of the population. In Locarno separate arrangements are made for teaching French and German in primary schools. In the canton of Fribourg there are two sets of schools to impart education, one in German and the other in French.

We may further point out the rights the minority enjoyed in Czechoslavakia before the occupation of the Sudetanland by Germany and in spite of that they complained of lack of an autonomous German section in the Ministry of Education. The complete complaint, which they formulated regarding the inadequate building and subsidy in the German University and the erection of the so-called minority schools, and the closing down of German primary and technical schools between 1931 and 1935, forms an interesting reading.

In the field of education the Sudetan Germans possessed their own university, two technical high schools, and academy of music, 90 secondary schools (55 gymnasia, 22 "Realshuler and 13 girls' schools), 14 training colleges, 629 commercial and agricultural schools, 430 higher and 3,363 lower primary schools, and 501 kindergartens.

When a small country like Switzerland can afford to impart education in three languages, surely more than one language can be taught in an Indian province. In Switzerland while arrangements are made to impart education in the mother tongue of the children, the Muslims in India are deprived of this benefit because of the unwillingness of Governments and local bodies to make adequate arrangements. The demands of the Muslims are treated light-heartedly and they are accused of communalism. All this is happening in spite of the constant reiteration of the Karachi minorities resolution by responsible Congress leaders. In view of these facts we are constrained to remark that the Congress High Command is not able to enforce its declared policy in the Congress-governed provinces, at least so far as the welfare of the Muslims in concerned.

PART III

DETAILS OF MUSLIM, GRIEVANCES

Bihar

In Bihar the deplorable effects of the Congress to force its politics on the younger generation together with its distinctly communal tendencies have given the greatest set-back to the

national cause, which it professes to espouse, by driving the Hindu and Muslim students into opposing camps. The attempts to hoist the Congress flag on all institutions and to introduce the Bande Matram song has had disastrous results on the relations between the students of the two communities, who had so far lived in harmonious co-operation.

It may be argued that the Government orders were meant simply to lift the ban on the song and the hoisting of the Congress flag but the Government cannot be unaware of the fact that, in spite of the optional nature of its circular, teachers and those responsible for the management of schools have been encouraged to ignore the feelings of the Muslims and they lose no opportunity of offending Muslim sentiments.

In a letter sent by the Muslim students to the Prime Minister the following incidents were enumerated:

The Congress flag was hoisted and Bande Matram sung on the formation of the Congress Ministry.

Both the hoisting of the flag and the singing of the Bande Matram were repeated on Independence Day and the Muslim students were persuaded to take part in the functions on the false promise that neither of these things would take place.

This was again repeated on the Prize Distriburtion Day.

As to how the atmosphere in the educational institutions has been vitiated by over-zealous schoolmasters will be apparent from a statement of Syed Abdul Aziz, Bar-at-Law, a former Minister:

"Muslim students sincerely and whole-heartedly intended to participate in the meeting convened to inaurgurate the scheme for mass literacy. They joined the procession on the assurance by some teachers and headmasters that no flag of politcial significance would be carried, no political slogan raised and no political song would be sung on this occasion, which was purely of an educational character and was of common interest to all classes of people, irrespective of religion or political creed.

"This assurance, however, came to be broken no sooner than it was given, as some Hindu students began to unfurl Congress flags and shout Bande Matram, which caused the Muslim students to say Allah-o-Akbar. By the time the procession arrived at the Science College excitement became intense and violence broke out.

"At least two Muslim students received injuries with a sharp cutting weapon. I, myself saw when I arrived on the balcony where some leading ladies and gentlemen were seated, a Muslim lad of about fourteen years of age standing near Dr Syed Mahmud with blood oozing from his neck. The boy stated that he had been hit with a *kirpan* by a Sikh. His brother, Mannan, was protesting in a state of great excitement against the assault upon Muslim students. Neither of them came to the meeting armed with any weapon nor did they intend to cause any disturbance."

The Muslim students of T.K. Ghosh's Academy, Patna, went on strike following the expulsion of six students in connection with the agitation regarding the song Bande Matram. The unfortunate young men who were expelled found it impossible to get admission into any other institution. The Muslims of Patna have been forced to open a separate school.

The questions of Bande Matram and the hoisting of the Congress flag in schools have become very serious. There has been some trouble over this issue in the Ram Mohan Seminary at Bankipore and other schools in the province. There was also some trouble on the occasion of the launching of the campaign for the removal of illiteracy over Bande Matram between Muslim and Hindu students. This has already been described in the statement of Syed Abdul Aziz. As long as a solution of the question is not reached it will be a perpetual source of friction between the two communities.

Local Bodies

Under the system of joint electorates the type of Muslims that are returned to the local bodies do not truly represent Muslim interests and do not enjoy the confidence of their community. A resolution was passed by the Provincial League of Bihar urging the boycott of elections to the local bodies. That the Muslims are determined to make the resolution effective is proved by the success of the boycott of Municipal elections at Motihari, Darbhanga, Samastipur, Katihar and other places.

There is a good deal of agitation against joint electorate in the local bodies as the Muslims had no chance of being returned unless they had the support of the Congress, which they could not expect unless they joined the Congress and the Muslims at present are not prepared to do so. The Government have not taken any notice of the most legitimate demands of the Muslims with the result that the Muslims have further boycotted the Municipal elections. They have further decided to boycott the elections of the District Boards.

Cow Protection

Various methods are employed to stop the slaughter of cows. We have received information that butchers, while returning with cattle from market places, have been assaulted. For instance, a few butchers were bringing cattle from village Kali, Sub-Division Jehanabad. They were attacked by Hindus at village Durmi in the Sadar Sub-Division, District Patna, and one of them was severely wounded with a spear and was admitted into hospital.

In some of the Municipal towns licences for selling beef in particular quarters, where they used to sell it before, have been cancelled. In some places licences are not at all granted to butchers to carry on their trade. For instance, at Hatipur, a sub-division in the District of Muzaffarpur, such licences have of late been withheld.

The Muslims have repeatedly complained that orders under section 144. Cr. P. C. have been promulgated with a view to deprive them of their civil rights and religious liberties. In a statement issued by the Working Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League it has been shown how the Muslims suffer under a sense of injustice in that province. The Working Committee reviews some of the actions and the policy of the Local Government and their officials in respect of certain rights of the Muslims in Bihar. The Committee feels that the present Government has far surpassed the foreign bureaucratic rule in attempting to deprive the Muslims of their most important religious and civil rights. It is a national tragedy, says the Committee, that the Muslims feel so unsafe under provincial autonomy. It has been held by various courts, including the Privy Council, that the Muslims have a legal and religious right to sacrifice cows. Such being the legal aspect of this right, the treatment meted out to the Muslims of Manjhaul, District Bhagalpur, stands out as a conspicuous example of Congress high-handedness. Manjhaul consists of 300 to 400 Muslim houses only. The inhabitants of the village assert that from time immemorial they have performed cow sacrifice in the village on Bakr-Id days and showed the representatives of the Muslim League receipts of sales of cow hides tallying with the Bakr-Id festivals of previous years. The Hindus of the surrounding villages reported to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Madhipur, that no cow sacrifice ever took place in the said village, on which the Officer issued a notice against twelve persons under section 144, Cr. P.C. prohibiting them from sacrificing cows. The Muslims sent telegrams of protest to the Bihar Premier and the

District Magistrate, on which the Hindus of the neighbouring villages, numbering from 10,000 to 15,000, surrounded the village armed with deadly weapons. Getting wind of this the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police along with a posse of armed constables reached the spot and on their assurance that they would allow no cow sacrifice the Hindus dispersed. On their way back they set fire to sugarcane fields and destroyed wheat crops belonging to the Muslims.

In these circumstances Muslims would have to decide soon whether they should migrate from this province or face annihilation if the present state of constant conflict with a section of Hindus and perpetual anxiety and insecurity, suffering and humiliation continue. The question also formed the subject-matter of an adjournment motion in the Bihar Legislative Assembly.

The mover, Mr Ali Manzar, pointed out that the one great source of all communal trouble had been the unsettled, indefinite, vague and vacillating policy of the Congress Government in matters of cow slaughter and music before mosques. He maintained that the Muslims had the right to slaughter cows irrespective of customs, provided it was done with reasonable precaution. Another Muslim speaker complained that the order under section 144, Cr. P. C. was promulgated against Muslims only. The policy adopted and action taken by the Bihar Government in extending the period of notice under section 144, Cr. P. C. was unprecedented in the whole country as the special power to extend the period of six months under special Government notification has never been adopted by any Government in the past.

Kunwar Kalika Prasad Sinha narrating the history of the case said that "it was admitted that the village of Amin had the customary right of cow slaughter. The dispute was whether the Muslims had the right of cow slaughter on Bakr-Id alone or could they slaughter on other days also."

Another speaker stressed the fact that non-violence was a fundamental principle of the Congress and promulgation of section 144, Cr. P.C. to avoid violence was thoroughly justified.

The promulgation of the order under section 144, Cr. P.C. and the grounds given by the Government for its extension that the Muslims may have an opportunity of getting their rights declared by a civil court amply show that the Congress Governments have no definite policy. The residents of Zahidabad, Gorakhpur, U.P., had obtained a declaratory decree from

the civil court in their favour but the district authorities stopped the cow sacrifice on the Bakr-Id day by an order under section 144, Cr. P. C. on the ground that such sacrifice would lead to a breach of peace. In Bihar the Congress Government issued similar orders on the pretext of giving the Muslims a chance to secure a civil court decree but the idea behind both orders was to prevent Muslims from sacrificing cows.

Further, the principle of non-violence which proved so successful a weapon in fighting the British bureaucracy, was now to be used for depriving the minority of their just rights. When cow sacrifice takes place inside houses with due precaution and without any advertisement the establishment of a customary right by producing impartial witnesses becomes an impossibility. We think that the chance of breaches of peace will, on the contrary, increase by such a policy. The object of those who want to put a stop to cow sacrifice would be achieved by creating such circumstances which are likely to lead to a breach of peace even in places where Muslims and Hindus have hitherto lived peacefully. Generally, when it is known that a certain commuuity is taking the law in its own hands, the Government should promulgate orders under section 144, Cr. P. C. to stop such high-headedness and not to stop the performance of the accepted religious duty of the aggrieved community.

It may be further observed that when in this particular case it was admitted that the Muslims had a right to cow sacrifice on one particular day and it did not hurt anybody's religious susceptibilities on that particular day, how could it do on other days? If the residents of one village can perform their civil rights at a particular spot and without exception being taken to it what justification can there be if others come and join them.

These facts lead us to think that the orders issued under section 144, Cr. P. C. were not likely to establish friendly relations between the two communities or inspire confidence in the Government.

Suppression of Language

Replying to a question in the Bihar Legislative Assembly regarding the use of script in all courts, the Premier said that the procedure in the civil and criminal courts was governed by the Government notification dated June 1, 1937, on the subject of court language, but not in the revenue courts. Government had permitted Urdu script in revenue courts but the manner in which it was to be enforced was under examination.

Although Urdu is allowed in courts as one of the optional languages, it is always discouraged by the presiding officers and the clerks. If documents, statements and petitions are filed in Urdu, Hindi copies of the same are generally required by the courts. The officials have got to pass a departmental examination in Hindi but no such departmental examination is held in Urdu.

General Policy of Government

As regards the general policy of the Bihar Congress Government we cannot do better than reproduce relevant portions of the resolution passed by the Working Committee of the Bihar Muslim League which throws ample light on the subject. The following are the extracts from the resolution:

This meeting of the Working Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League has reviewed some of the actions and policies of the Local Government and their professions in respect of the rights and interests of Muslims in Bihar and feels that the present Government have far surpassed the foreign bureaucratic rule in attempting to rob the Muslims of some of their most important religious and civic rights and are undermining their position in the false name of law and order which has become a most dangerous shibboleth of the ruling party and a premanent pretext to perpetrate acts of gross injustice and tyranny upon the weak.

"The policy of the British in India was one of neutrality in religious matters of the subjects and the former Government did fulfil this policy in a large measure, though they failed in many cases to protect the Muslims in exercising their religious and civic rights and in come cases did great wrongs to them in the name of peace by siding with aggressive and bigoted people who happened to be in the majority. This tendency to scatter the rights of the minority to the winds has of late become greatly augmented."

A National Tragedy

It is a national tragedy that at no time in modern age certain minorities, particularly the Muslims, have felt so unsafe and so aggrieved as they do now under Provincial Autonomy by the unwise policy and unjust action of the present Government which has surrendered to militant mobs, composed mostly of ignorant, biased and intolerant people and assembled to prevent Muslims on various occasions from performing certain religious acts and exercising their civic rights.

Right of Cow Slaughter

Amongst the rights so ignored and encroached upon is the right of the Muslims to sacrifice cows during the Bakr-Id festival and eat beef on any day or occasion they like. The Government and their officials have by executive orders recently prevented Muslims at a large number of places in different parts of the Province from killing a cow or a buffalo, not only during Bakr-Id but on any day. This unjust and oppressive action has been taken in the name of law and order and on the false ground that the Muslims did not prove the custom to sacrifice cow or that they proposed to kill cows openly or that it was a nuisance in the eyes of some people, and so on.

Present Anomalies and Irregularties

In the first place it is not difficult for any impartial and reasonable person to see that when a cow is killed inside a house or in an enclosed or secluded place without informing the Hindus the custom cannot be proved by any evidence except that of Muslims concerned. But curiously enough little or no weight is attached to the claim and evidence of the Muslims.

Secondly, if in any case a report of the sacrifice is made to the Thana (police station) of the locality, those making the report and the records of the report, in a vast majority of cases, are Hindus and it is not in their interest, on communal and other grounds, to keep correct and full information on the subject.

Thirdly, if a report is made and recorded it is one-sided and made behind the back of the Muslims concerned.

Right Irrespective of Customs

Fourthly, sacrifice of a cow has been prevented even where documentary evidence of custom kept at the Thana has been found. And above all, the rights of the Muslims to slaughter cows, eat, buy or sell beef is irrespective of any custom and can be exercised as any other religious or civic right.

These invented grounds are being urged more widely than ever before. Some of the Municipalities, dominated and run by the majority community and the Congress party, are preventing the Muslims in the exercise of their old and legitimate trade, namely, to sell beef, or even mutton at a shop. This is being done either by executive orders and by threats of violence from riotous mobs who are treated as arbiters in the matters of rights of the Muslim community.

This meeting of the Working Committee of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League views with alarm the situation created by the Government and is surprised at their reply to Mr Ali Manzar's adjournment motion in the Bihar Legislative Assembly on the 25th June that the Muslims of Amin in the District of Monghyr should go to a civil court to prove their custom to kill cows for domestic consumption on ordinary days and that the Government will then consider whether the right, if so established, should be recognised by them or not.

"It has already been held by various courts, including the highest tribunal (the Privy Council) in a number of cases, that the Muslims have a religious and civic right to sacrifice or kill cows for beef without seeking to derive authority from any custom. And, above all, the Muslims cannot allow any of their religious rights to be made dependent on custom or a decision of any court. Their right to sacrifice cows is based on their scripture (Koran) and no authority can be recognised by them as higher than, or equal to, this book in religious matters."

Congress Punishing Muslims

"This meeting condemns the action of the Government in punishing and humiliating the Muslims of Meghwan, Majhaul, Amin and other places, who only wanted to exercise a well-recognised right and in allowing the Hindus to go free, though they had formed riotous and unlawful assemblies and had caused considerable damage to the property of the Muslims maliciously. The policy and action of the Government and some of their officials, have had the effect of encouraging a section of Hindus to take the law in their own hands and prove the triumph of brute force and unlawful acts over justice and reason.

Outrageous and Unworthy of State

It would be an outrageous policy, unworthy of any Government, to prevent a person or party from exercising his just rights on the ground that another party, who may happen to be in the majority, objects to the exercise of that right and, therefore, the weaker or the party in the minority must be deprived of their right in the name of law and order. Muslims have been enjoined by their religion to prevent idol-worship and other idolatrous practices. Will the Government abolish or restrict idol-worship and prohibit public exhibition of idols in processions in the name of law and order, if some Muslims object to it or form an unlawful assembly to secure their object?

In the interest of the Hindus and Muslims and in the name of toleration and good administration, it is necessary to demand

from the Government a clear and definite statement of their policy on the question of killing cows. Do they intend to deprive the Muslims of their rights gradually and expose them to attacks or do they propose to perform their duties of protecting the weak firmly and effectively? Are they afraid to do the right or will they admit their incapacity to do it?

Will Muslims Migrate from Bihar

Muslims will have to decide soon whether they should migrate from this province or face annihilation if the present state of constant conflicts with a section of Hindus and perpetual anxiety, insecurity, sufferings and humiliations continue owing to the present policy of the Government.

"If this course is impracticable and undesirable they may in a body adopt another course to settle the vexed question once for all. It is perhaps useless to remind the Congress Party of their professions in the past and resolutions adopted at Karachi and other places since they appear to have been made without the intention of fulfilling them. If the Government wish to see the Hindus and the Muslims involved more deeply and widely in a disastrous quarrel of a lasting character the Government might go on pursuing the policy they have adopted instead of preaching and practising and enforcing absolute toleration in matters of religious or sentimental differences between the two communities and punishing and restraining only the aggressors and opponents of a right effectively and compensating the weak and the aggrieved."

Communal Riots

Muslims in Bihar are mostly concentrated in the towns, only a very small minority being in the rural areas. But those that live in the villages are in constant dread of the Hindu majority and events have fully established that their anxieties and fears are neither unfounded nor unreal. There used to be communal outbreaks in the past but since the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy these have increased greatly in number.

Tilkori

At Tilkori, a village in district Hazaripur, where out of a population of 2,000 only 30 are Muslims (male adults being only 17) a riot occurred on April 24, 1938. A Muslim of the village was giving a wedding dinner to his co-religionists and was, for that purpose, preparing beef in his house. A number of Hindus of the village came to his house and charged him with killing a

cow and demanded the head and skin of the animal alleged to have been slaughtered. The Muslim tried to assure the Hindus that the beef had been brought from a neighbouring village but the Hindus, refusing to accept this statement as true, forcibly entered the *zenana* quarters of the Muslim house, dragged him out and belaboured him. Two Muslims of the village were beaten and, helpless as they were, the mouth of a living pig was inserted into their mouths, an action highly shocking to Muslim sentiment. Four of the injured Muslims were sent to hospital. A report of the incident was made to the police by the village Chowkidar but until the arrival of the police Hindu lawlessness continued and even the police were able to restore order with some difficulty.

This incident, serious though it was, failed to attract the immediate attention either of the Government or the Congress. Atrocities bordering on Nazi terrorism had been perpetrated on a microscopic minority in a village and the Congress remained unmoved. Compare this with the prompt notice taken both by the Congress and the Government of a minor quarrel between a local zamindar and a Congress worker about a month before this riot in an adjoining village. Protest meetings were held and a huge demonstration was organised by local Congress workers. Even the Government sent one of their Parliamentary Secretaries post-haste to make inquiries on the spot.

Since the report was written the case has been decided. The Magistrate was disinclined to believe the story of the mouth of a living pig being inserted into the mouth of Muslims.

Bhagalpur

As regards the Bhagalpur riots, Mr M. A. Mannan, General Secretary of the Bhagalpur District Muslim League, wrote a lengthy letter in the Advance, Calcutta, and dealt in detail with the situation in this district. We reproduce a paragraph from his letter here:

"It has now been well established beyond any doubt by statemants issued from time to time by Molvi Abdul Hameed Qasumi (Congress), Assistant Secretary of the Muslim Mass Contact Sub-Committee, Bhagalpur, Mr Qasim Hussain, B.L., Congress Municipal Commissioner and zamindar, Mr. Jameel Ahmad Khan, B.L., Pleader and Congress Municipal Commissioner, Maulana Minhatullah Sahib, an Independent Party M.L.A. and no less a person than Maulana Ahmad Saeed a great supporter of the Cong ess and President of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind that the Hindu Mahasabhaites and Congressmen

of Bhagalpur entered into an unholly alliance with each other and were thus making preparations and fomenting agitation against Muslims three months previous to the day of the actual riots in Bhagalpur."

So far we have received no information of any disciplinary action being taken against the Congressmen responsible for creating communal trouble according to the statement of responsible Muslim Congressmen. We have purposely abstained from giving the details of these riots which are only too well-known to the public to need repetition here.

Khairatia

It was on December 1, 1937, that Mr Abdul Ghani M.L.A. came to know of the riot at Khairatia village, Saran district. He immediately proceeded to the village and found that the houses of Muslims had been burnt and looted and several persons had been badly wounded. Some of the Muslims had fled to Seewan on the very night of the occurrence. The Muslims were panic-stricken as no help was rendered to them. Mr Abdul Ghani on his arrival rendered first aid to the injured men. The village is divided into two main parts of which the northern half is entirely populated with Hindus and the southern one mainly by Muslims. This Muslim quarter is a narrow strip of land extending over several hundred feet, but is very thinly populated and is surrounded on all sides by Hindu houses. Hindus were greatly annoyed with the Muslims since last Bakr-Id festival when the latter filed a civil suit for declaration of their civil right of cow sacrifice in the village. This appears to have enraged the Hindus of the locality.

According to our information, in November last some trouble arose when the sugarcane of one Muslim peasant was being cut. Hindus assembled near the field and a crowd of many thousands attacked the Muslims, who were overpowered. They fled from their lives and some of them took shelter in their houses and some in a mosque. The Hindu rioters, who came from neighbouring villages, started looting and setting fire to the Muslim houses. Even the mosque was not spared by the Hindus who attacked the Muslims there with spears, lathis and brick-bats. A number of Muslims were injured and many had spear wounds. Pools of blood were found inside the mosque and its outer verandah by Mr Abdul Ghani when he visited the mosque which, too, was badly damaged by the rioters. A shop, which has started to meet the needs of the Muslims who had been boycotted by the Hindu shop-keepers of the village, was also looted and destroyed altogether.

It is regrettable no help was rendered to these sufferers either by the Congress workers or by the Seva Samiti volunteers. Though responsible Congress workers were seen returning from the village Lohganjar, the headquarters of the rioters, by Mr Abdul Ghani, the next day after the occurrence, they did not bother to have a look at their Muslim brothers whom they so often ask to join the Congress on economic issue.

It is indeed shocking to describe in words the brutalities, tyrannies and oppression perpetrated upon the poor Muslims of this village. All utensils, clothes, agricultural implements, animals, grain and other necessities of life were either burnt and destroyed or taken away by the rioters. The women and children took shelter in the neighbouring sugarcane fields. The Muslims had no grain left in their houses and no clothes to protect them from cold. Altogether 19 Muslims were injured while two Hindus received minor injuries. Most of the Muslims had to be removed to the Siwan Hospital and were laid up there for weeks.

When we visited the locality the case was pending in court We refrain from giving our findings.

Darbhanga

Mr Muslehuddin, Secretary of the District Muslim League, Lahiria Sarai, personally investigated into the following incidents and submitted to us the following report:

At Maghwan, police station Benipatti, Madhubani, notices were served under section 144, Cr. P.C. prohibiting the Muslims from performing cow sacrifice on the occasion of Bakr-Id, which was being performed in the village since time immemorial. Those on whom the notices were served performed no sacrifice but others did. Cases against the latter are pending. As a protest against the statement of the Bihar Premier in the Legislative Assembly, during the pendency of the cases that the Muslims of Maghwan sacrificed cows against custom, the accused persons have refused to defend themselves on the ground that the Premier's statement on the sub-judice cases had entirely prejudiced their defence.

Madhuour

The Hindus of Madhupur boycotted the Muslims three months after the Bakr-Id to get an assurance from the Muslims that they would not perform any cow sacrifice in future. Arrangements were made by the Muslim League to help the Muslims. A mud bazaar was built by the League members of

Ratwara and Maniarpur, and several respectable League members who had never before done any manual work, lent a hand in the building of the bazaar for Muslim shop-keepers.

A Hindu teacher removed the Muslim League flag from the school while he allowed the Congress flag to remain there.

Siswar

The Hindus prohibited the Muslims from calling the Azan. A case was filed in the court. Then the Congressmen built two paper effigies, one representing a Hindu and the other a Muslim with a long beard and a Turkish cap. A person started striking the beard with a stick saying, "Pray to the Congress Pandit for relief otherwise you will be nowhere." The police took immediate steps and an ugly situation was averted.

Central Provinces and Berar

Since the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy Muslims in no other province have suffered so much as in the Central Provinces and Berar, where they form a very small minority and are poor and educationally backward.

The province is almost entirely agricultural but the number of Muslim agriculturists is very small. The Muslims are mostly workers in mills or Biri manufacturers.

In fourteen districts of the province Hindi is the commonly spoken language, while in Berar and the greater part of the five districts which constitute the revenue division of Nagpur, Marathi is the predominant language Muslims all over the province speak Urdu. Before Berar was transferred to British rule the court language of this province was Urdu.

Bande Matram

Muslims from all parts of the province complain that the song Bande Matram is forced upon Muslim boys in Government schools and in those managed by Municipalities and other Local Bodies. Khan Saheb Abdul Rahman Khan, K.L.A. visited the Vidya Mandir Training College and found that Muslim boys were compelled to stand with folded hands when this song was sung.

The Premier has issued instructions that all officials should stand when Bande Matram is sung.

Khan Saheb Abdur Rehman Khan Khan states in the Star dated July 10, 1938, that the time of the presentation of a civic address to Mr S.C. Bose at Nagpur when the Song Bande

Matram was being sung the Congress Premier himself asked the audience to stand up. He was himself subjected to ridicule and abuses by the Congress organ Samaj Sevak, edited by the Secretary of the District Congress Committee, on having refused to stand at the time of the recital of Bande Matram at a meeting addressed by Mr Gupta, a Congress Minister.

Moulvi Abdul Haq, in a letter to Mahatma Gandhi, published in the New Times dated September 20, 1938, says: "The Indian National Congress makes so much of its promise to safeguard the language and cultural interests of the minorities. That being so, you will feel shocked to know what a representative of my Anjuman had to witness at the village school of Pandharana in the district of Chindwara. Before the day's work was begun in that school, the Muslim boys had to offer, with folded hands, along with the Hindu boys, *parasthna* before the image of the goddness Saraswati. It was found that the Muslim boys were not to wish each other in their usual Islamic way, but to say *Namaste* and *Ramji-ki-Jai.* I ask you is this safeguarding the interest of our language and culture?"

Local Bodies

In the Central Provinces and Berar there are 83 Local Boards which are elected on the system of joint electorate without any reservation of seats. It is almost impossible for the Muslims to get themselves elected under the present system. Previous Governments used to redress communal inequalities by means of nominations. But since the Congress has assumed the reins of Government, even this method does not help the Muslims, for nominations are made for party purposes and the interest of Muslims are ignored. The Muslims are thus much worse off than they were under the previous Government.

Debt Conciliation Boards

The Government appoints practically for each Tehsil of the province a Debt Conciliation Board consisting of all non-official representatives of debtors and creditors. The only exception is the Chairman who is usually a Government servant. Prior to the assumption of office by the Congress there was not a single Board without at least one Muslim on it. But now under the Congress regime there are many such Boards without any Muslim representation. It may be added that the Muslims in this province, are generally very poor and are largely in debt. The Muslim members on these Boards epresented the interests of not only his community but also of

debtors in general. The creditors are usually Marwaris and Brahmans who usually carry influence with the Congress.

It was further represented to us that friends and relations of the Ministers were appointed members of these Boards, while Muslims and Harijans were excluded.

Cow Protection

A notice was served by the Municipality of Jubbulpore imposing extra taxes and other restrictions on cattle dealers. A bill has been moved in the C.P. Legislative Assembly to amend the C.P. Slaughter of Animals Act. The Muslims complain that if the Amendment Bill is passed it will make impossible not only animal slaughter for commercial purposes but also for social and religious purposes. Under the cover of economic and sanitary grounds and in the name of protection of animals attempts are being made to put a stop to the slaughter of animals by means of legislation and municipal regulations.

Reports of organised efforts in the cattle markets preventing the sale of cattle to Muslims were also made to us. Khan Saheb Abdur Rahman Khan has pointed out in the Star of July 10, 1938: "The majority of local bodies have put heavy restrictions and have levied prohibitive fees on the slaughter of animals, the most objectionable of them being those which were adopted in the regime of the Hon'ble Dr D. P. Misra (now a Congress Minister) as Chairman of Jubbulpore Municipality. The bye-laws prepared by Mr Misra were kept in abeyance on the interference of the C.P. Government and that of the Government of India but they were confirmed and brought into force on the very day on which the Congress Government accepted office and Mr D.P. Misra assumed the charge of the Local Self-Government protfolio.

Mr M.G. Chitnavis is the President of the C.P. Hindu Sabha and Vice-President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha. He brought a Bill in the Provincial Assembly to prohibit cow and caltle slaughter throughout the province. This is how the Bill was introduced. On December 10, 1937, the Speaker at 1.15 p.m. asked whether there was going to be any motion. Mr Chitnavis was absent. He attended the Assembly at 4 p.m. His motion for circulation was allowed even without asking for an explanation from him or inviting objections from the House.

Suppression of Language and Culture

The Muslims generally complain of want of Urdu schools even in districts like Saugor and Madla where the number of Muslims is enough to justify the opening of such schools. In high schools the medium of instruction is Hindi of Marathi. It is reported that some Municipal Boards abolished Urdu classes, while one refused grant to a secondary Urdu school. The Anjuman Islamia Press at Jubbulpore was supported by the old Government. An arrangement was made by which Government printing work was given to that press and the profits were utilised for the maintenance of the Anjuman Islamia High School. The Congress Government is now contemplating to change this arrangement without providing funds for the school.

No application in Urdu is entertained by Municipal Committees. Complaints are also made of the want of supervision in Urdu Primary schools.

Speeches delivered in Urdu in Assembly are reported in Hindi or short summary of them is given in English. When the Speaker was approached and the questions were asked in the Assembly both the Speaker and the Premier expressed their inability to grant request for speeches being reported in Urdu.

The whole of the Betul district has been converted into a compulsory education area. The Government has provided for expenditure with the express condition that medium of instruction will be only Hindi. Thus the whole population of a district is being systematically converted into a Hindi-speaking population.

The following is a quotation from the letter of the Speaker of the C.P. and Berar Assembly to K.S. Abdur Rahman:

"As to the point of Urdu being recognised as one of the vernaculars of the Assembly, the question involved is probably a matter for Government. As it must have Government recognition as a language of the province, the use of the script, of course, presents a difficulty which we all know."

The Government admits that there is not single Urdu school throughout the rural areas of Saugor district, while there are only five Urdu schools in urban area. Five schools situated in a city cannot satisfy the education of the whole district. This is another district where the Muslims are converted into Hindi-speaking population at the cost of their language and culture.

We reproduce here a circular letter from the Chairman, Local Board, Chandwar, which is one of the glaring examples of the methods adopted by the local bodies under the Congress regime to systematically force Hindi culture and religion on Muslims in minority provinces. The fact that the Chairman of a Local Board asked the Headmaster of Urdu schools (where Muslims are in overwhelming majorities) to have the worship of an image of Mahatma Gandi as part of the birthday celebrations, shows how callous the Congress is of the religious sentiments of the Muslims whose religious rights are supposed to be safe in the Karachi Congress resolution on minority rights.

Circular

Jawak No. 446
Dated 24th September, 1938.

From

The Chairman, Local Board,
Chandwar.

The Headmaster of the Urdu School. . . . is informed that September 2 is the birthday of that great personality Mahatma Gandhi, who has given the message of truth and non-violence (Satya and Ahinsa) to the world. Therefore, celebrations in honour of Mahatma Gandhi's birthday should be held in all schools.

On that day from 8 to 9 in the morning all members of the School Managing Committee as also all other gentry of the village should be invited to the School. The picture of Mahatma Gandhi should be worshipped and his high ideals should be explained to the audience.

After this the meeting should be dispersed and I should be informed, by return post, of the celebrations in connection with Mahatma Gandhi's birthday.

(Sd.) Khandy Rao Pando Rang Deshmukh,
Chairman, Local Board, Chandwar.

Viddia Mandir Scheme

The word "Mandir" in common parlance means a place of idol worship. As such the very name goes against the grain of Islamic tenets and becomes repulsive to a Muslim. Knowing all this full well, it is surprising how the great champions of Indian nationalism, the Congress Ministers, could give such a

communal and anti-Islamic name to a scheme of education which is meant for the children of all communities. According to the scheme:

"Every village or group of villages within a radius of a mile having no schools and where about 40 boys and girls of school-going age are available shall have a Viddia Mandir. . . In all Viddia Mandirs, education shall be through the medium of the mother-tongue. We shall have, therefore, Marathi Viddia Mandirs, Hindi Viddia Mandirs and Urdu Viddia Mandirs, according to the needs and circumstances of the residents of each place where Viddia Mandirs are founded".

In theory the scheme does not neglect Urdu but in actual practice Urdu has been entirely extinguished. According to the scheme, the schools will be founded within a radius of one mile if 40 boys and girls of school-going age are available and the schools will be according to the needs and circumstances of the residents of each place.

In a province like Central Provinces, where the Muslims are only four per cent of the total population, will it be possible to have Urdu Viddia Mandirs under the scheme?

It is stated on behalf of the scheme:

"The name is attractive in more ways than one. To 99 per cent of the population in villages, it will be a source of inspiration, and it is hoped that it will appeal to their generous and charitable minds."

Considering the proportion of the Muslim population in the rural areas it is clear from the above quotation that the scheme is meant for the benefit of the majority community only and the appeal to the generous and charitable minds of the 99 per cent of the total population in village is purely of a communal nature.

The scheme has already been elaborately criticised and commented upon by eminent educationists like Maulana Abdul Haque and others, so there is no need for us to say anything further.

Communal Tendencies of the Congress Regime

Several instances were given to us to show the communal tendency of responsible Congressmen. It was pointed out that one of the Ministers presided over a gathering held in honour of the President of the Hindu Mahasabha. Further, it was pointed out that the Congress Government had provided a huge

sum of money for the Hanuman Akhara, which is the training ground for the Mahasabha. At a conference held under the presidentship of Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose and attended by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru a huge decorative arch was put up in the name of Mr Savarkar, the Mahasabha President.

The Central Provinces Congress Committee, according to Mr Abdur Rahman's statement, had issued instructions that while a Hindu could enlist himself as a member of the Mahasabha and the Congress at one and the same time, no Muslim could become a member both of the Muslim League and the Congress.

Mr Savarkar was presented with civic addresses at Khamgaon, Darwha, Yeotmal, Nagpur, Akola, where Congressmen took an active part in the functions. Prominent and leading Congressmen also addressed reception meetings held in honour of Mr Savarkar. The Hon'ble Mr R.M. Deshmukh, a Congress Minister, presided over a reception given to Mr Savarkar at Nagpur. A decorative arch was erected and named after Mr Savarkar at Shendurjana where the Berar Congress Committee held a Congress conferenee under the presidentship of Mr Sarat Chandra Bose and which was attended by no less a person than the then Congress President, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The Prime Minister has admitted that individual Congressmen attended the meetings addressed by Mr Savarkar. This does prove that Mr Savarkar still attracts the Congress people in the C.P. and Berar.

Undue Influence on Muslims

In the village Behli, Saugor district, it was pointed out to us that Muslim labourers were turned out by their Hindu employers because they had voted for the Muslim League candidate in the Assembly bye-election. The poor men had to migrate to the city and elsewhere to seek their livelihood.

It was also represented to us that a sum of Rs. 500 used to be paid to the Mohammad Ali Serari but since the Congress came into power the amount has been stopped and a resolution passed transferring the amount to the Shradhaband Asthan.

Communal Riots

A resolution was moved by Mr N.P. Misra in the C.P. and Berar Legislative Assembly recommending to the Government to institute an inquiry into the causes that led to the disturbances at Jubbulpore during the last Dassehra festival. Khan

Saheb Abdur Rahman Khan wanted to propose an amendment which wanted to extend the inquiry to the general causes of communal dissensions in the province. It was ruled that the amendment was not within the scope of the resolution. The Prime Minister gave an assurance that he would personally make an inquiry. The Hon'ble Member representing the Anglo-Indian community thought that an inquiry as to why a certain trouble arose in Jubbulpore was almost futile. There were deeper causes underlying the communal trouble than just isolated outbreaks here and there.

The motion was adopted and the inquiry was held by the Hon'ble the Premier. Up to the time of our visit to the province the findings of the inquiry were not available. Speaking on the Holi riot, Mr V.R. Kalapa, a non-Muslim, in his speech remarked that a riot had taken place five months before, but the same officials continued to remain in charge of Jubbulpore, though they had failed to manage a similar situation. Mr A.N. Haq thought that it was no use hiding the fact that there was a feeling among the members of the majority community that the Congress Government meant Hindu Raj.

The C. P. Premier thought that certain persons wanted to seek notoriety by creating communal discord.

Later an adjournment motion was moved. Mr Iftikhar Ali said that the Moharram procession was boycotted by Hindus. There had never been any communal disturbance on that occasion. Notices were served under section 107, Cr. P. C. against a number of Muslims. Stones were thrown on the Muslim procession. Reports were made to the police and the Muslims maintained peace. Two or three persons were seen throwing stones. One of them was a resident of a distant mohalla. That shows what the man was there for, In spite of the fact that the Moharram processionists had mashals and lathies and were repeatedly provoked, they maintained a peaceful attitude. In one case the head of a pig was thrown on a tazia and yet the Muslims did not retaliate.

Mr Iftikhar Ali further reminded the House that only one incident of alleged stone-throwing at the last Dassehra festival had created a riot which lasted for more than a week. The Holi procession was arranged, according to the Speaker, in a manner in which it had never been arranged before. Hitherto the Holy procession used to move in particular mohallas only and then dispersed. This year the procession was taken from one end of the town to the other.

Mr. Hardas (Depressed Class) took the view that the inquiry in to the causes of Hindu-Muslim dispute might involve the examination of some responsible members of the Congress Party. According to his view, the Muslims sought the protection of his Excellency the Governor and not of the Ministers because they had no confidence in them. The Speaker also referred to the dispute over the proposed regulation regarding registration of marriages in the Jubbulpore Municipality. He therefore, appealed that the inquiry may not be undertaken. He added that the first inquiry had remained incomplete.

We do not propose to give details of atrocities committed. We shall confine ourselves to some general observations. We are inclined to agree with the observation made by the Rev. Bogers, the representative of the Anglo-Indian community, during the debate that took place on the appointment of an inquiry committee in connection with the riots, that "the causes lie deeper." We are inclined to think that the general policy of the Government has not been conducive to the creation of a peaceful atmosphere. Stone-throwing may incidentally lead to a riot and the riot may be attributed to that fact, but where previous arrangements are made by any party they should naturally lead to the conclusion that riots are pre-arranged.

Before we conclude we may add that cases against all those arrested and charged with rioting in Jubbulpore have been withdrawn by the prosecution. The Muslims have strongly protested against this action of the Congress Government. It is action like this that leads to more communal tension and makes Muslims lose confidence in the government of the day.

Bombay Presidency

One of the handicaps under which Muslim minorities in the provinces labour is the provision in the Legislative Assembly Rules fixing the minimum number of members who must stand up to support adjournment motions before the House grants leave. In Bombay, the minimum necessary is 36, while there are only 30 Muslim members in the Legislative Assembly. Thus even if all the Muslim members join hands they cannot provide the requisite number for an adjournment motion. Most of the grievances of the Muslims of these minority provinces, specially those of Madras, Central Provinces and Berar, Orissa, Bihar and Bombay cannot, therefore, be ventilated on the floor of the Assemblies. Since the Congress Government came into power many injustices have been done to the Muslims but very few of them could be discussed in the Assembly due to the provisions in the Assembly Rules.

The Congress Government has issued orders to the District Officials to consult the Presidents of the local Congress Committees regarding (1) the nomination to the local bodies and Municipalities, (2) the allocation of seats on different bodies. No such orders have been issued about consulting the Muslim League officials, with the result that most of the nominations go to such Muslims who are definitely hostile to the League and, further, they are willing to subordinate the interests of the Muslim community to those of the Congress and the Hindu community.

Then there have been many instances in which a Government official, who refused to be intimidated, by the majority and upheld the just rights of the Muslims, has been victimised by being transferred. There is an Idgah at Rander in the Surat district. The waste land adjoining it belongs to the Government and was, until recently, used as a stand for vehicles during the Id festival. This land was also utilised by the peasants for storing their crops after cutting them. The Hindu peasants applied to the Government for permission to fence this land and thus prevent the Muslims from its use during the Id day. The Deputy Collector incharge of the Pargana, Mr Suleman K. Desai, refused to grant this permission. His decision was upheld by the higher revenue authorities on appeal and the Collector cancelled the permission for the land's use for harvesting. The Hindus filed a suit against the Government and the then Government filed a written statement denying the right of the Hindus and decided to contest the suit. When the Congress Government came into power, the Revenue Minister admitted the claim of the Hindus and allowed them to fence the land. Mr Desai was transferred from the district to Sholapur.

Then the European Superintendent of Police, Khaira district, who removed the wreath of leaves tied across the road to prevent the passing of the tazia procession by the Hindus of the Vehra village, was replaced by a Hindu officer soon after the incident.

Bande Matram

The School Boards of the local bodies in the Presidency have issued circulars ordering that the day's work in all schools should began with the singing of the Bande Matram. The School Board of the Ahmedabad District Board issued one such circular, which led to a protest by the Muslims of the district but they did not get any redress. Then, on October 2, 1938, the Ahmedabad Municipality arranged celebrations in

honour of Mahatma Gandhi's 70th Birthday. All teachers and pupils of the municipal schools, including Muslims, attended the celebrations, which began with the singing of the Bande Matram. Moreover, all the students were asked to wear Gandhi caps on the occasion and to join in the singing of the song. Other such instances were brought to our notice but we have purposely refrained from incorporating them in this report.

Local Bodies

The Congress Government has abolished the system of nomination to the local bodies. The Muslim League members in the Assembly too supported this decision of the Government. Unfortunately, however, the redistribution of seats in the various local boards has affected the minorities adversely. In boards where the Muslims had four seats in a total of 40 they have now been given only three out of 50 seats.

Then the seven wards of the Bombay Municipal Corporation have been divided into 19 wards. It may be added that this is the only municipality where there is joint electorate. Under the old system the Muslims used to get an average of 26 to 27 seats in a house of 114. But now as the result of the subdivision of the wards the Muslims would only be able to return 18 or 19 members. This is not our or the Bombay Muslims' estimate but that of the Congress Minister of Local Self-Government. It is thus clear that the redistribution of the wards is designed to cut down the number of Muslim seats. Muslims have been thrown in such minorities in different wards as to make them ineffective at the time of election.

Then the old City of Bombay Act provided that four seats on the Schools Committee of the Bombay Municipal Corporation should be reserved for Muslims. This representation of the Muslims was necessary as they have their special educational problems. Under the new Act even this reservation of seats has disappeared with the result that the Muslims would hardly be able to secure more than one or two seats on this committee. This would also adversely affect the Urdu schools under the Corporation.

Identical Interests with Mahasabha

The English school at Makhjan, Taluq Sangmeshwar district Ratnagri, gets a grant from the Education Department of the Provincial Government. It opened a Lathi Sangh in 1935 for physical education and affiliated this Sangh to the Hindu Sabha at Nagpur. A condition for admission to this Sangh is that all

pupils who want to join it should be members of the Hindu community. The Muslim students thus cannot get any benefit out of the Sangh, which is supported by public money. No separate arrangements have been made for the physical training of the Muslim students of this school.

Swaraj Equal to Ram Raj

Before the Congress took over the Government of the province, there was a provision in the budget of the interim Ministry for grant of scholarships to Muslim students as the Muslims are backward in secondary education. The Congress Cabinet cancelled this provision in the budget. This is one of the examples of how much the Congress cares for the educational advancement of the Muslims.

Suppression of Urdu Press

It was represented to us by the Bombay Provincial Muslim League that at the time of communal troubles in March last some Muslim papers were singled out for securities under section 144, Cr. P. C. and they were ordered to show their news relating to the riots to the Commissioner of Police, Bombay, before publication, while no action was taken against papers edited and owned by Hindus in spite of the fact that allegations of fomenting communal feelings were made against them.

There are very few Muslim papers in the province and their financial position is not very sound. Three papers, two Urdu and one Gujrati, are published from Bombay. One weekly is published from Ahmedabad, and one from Surat. These news papers used to get advertisements from the previous Government but these have stopped by the Congress Government. Since the Deen, Kalupur, Panchpatty, took up the cause of the Muslim League, it has ceased to get Government or Municipal advertisements. Similarly the Muslim Gujrati has been banned from all recognised libraries.

Closing or Burial Grounds

There is a 500-year-old Muslim burial ground in Ahmedabad, known as Pir Kamal's *Qabristan.* For the last four or five years the Municipality of Ahmedabad has started development of the locality round about the burial ground under the Town Planning Scheme and many rich Hindus have built houses in this part of the town. The Municipality, which has a Hindu majority, passed a resolution closing this burial ground. The District Muslim League took up the case of the Muslims and

wanted to stage a demonstration before the Town Hall on the day that the resolution was going to be discussed. The Municipal authorities, coming to know of the League's intention, called the help of the local authorities. The district authorities prevented the procession from entering the Town Hall compound and from holding a protest meeting in a nearby Maidan. The League thereupon held a meeting in the Jama Masjid and passed a resolution protesting against the closing of the burial ground. No action has been taken by the authorities for the restoration of this Muslim burial ground.

Scholarships Suspended

Applications for exemption from fees in schools are generally invited at the beginning of the session and all those who secure exemption enjoy it for the whole academic year. At Chiloda, Ahmedabad district, these exemptions were granted in the month of June, 1937 and among the recipients were several Muslim pupils. But after the communal tension in the locality during the month of September 1937, all the students were asked to apply afresh and the previous exemptions were cancelled. As a result of this extraordinary procedure all the Hindu students retained their freeships as their case was recommended by the members of the School Committee, while the applications of the Muslim boys were rejected because they were not recommended by the members of the School Committee. It is needless for us to point out what hardship this uncalled for procedure caused to the parents of the Muslim students.

Communal Riots

The Hindus of the village Satpati in the Palgarh Taluqa, District Thana, played music before a mosque on August 9, 1937. The Mussalmans tried to prevent it with the result that there was a minor Hindu-Muslim riot. The Muslims being in a very small mionrity had to yield and the Hindus kept on playing music, deliberately outraging the religious feelings of the Muslims, and no protection was given to the Muslims by the Government. The Muslims persisted in their demand to prevent a recurrence of the incident, but with no result. The Hindus in return socially boycotted the Muslims.

The Hindus of Vehra, a village in Khaira district, tied a toran (wreath of leaves) across the road in such a manner that on the day of Moharram tazias could not pass. The Muslims applied to the District Magistrate, who had the toran removed. The Hindus appealed to the higher authorities, who dismissed

the appeal. When the Congress came into power the Hindus appealed to the Government, who cancelled the previous orders of the revenue authorities and ordered the toran to be tied. The Muslims could not carry their tazias on the last day of Moharram this year. The Muslims appealed to the officers to get the toran removed at least temporarily to allow the tazias to pass but nothing was done. When the tazias were lying there for two days the European Superintendent of Police had the toran removed and the tazias passed but the Superintendent was immediately replaced by a Hindu officer.

Another Hindu-Muslim riot took place at Nadiad in Khaira district during Moharram this year. Stones were thrown on tazias and many shops looted. Sixteen complaints were lodged by the Muslims and nine complaints were lodged by the Hindus. The police registered two Muslim cases and five Hindu cases.

A similar incident occurred at Boisar in the Taluqa of Palgarh when Hindus played music before that mosque and on protest being lodged by the Muslims the Hindus boycotted them socially.

There was an agreement between the Hindus and Muslims of Dhanduka, a town in Ahmedabad, that music will not be played within a certain distance of a mosque. But the Hindus broke this agreement in August, 1938. Telegrams were sent to the district authorities and the Home Minister but no steps were taken to prevent the breach of the agreement.

United Provinces

The Muslims form only fourteen per cent of the total population of the United Provinces and of these the large majority are town dwellers. Of the urban population Muslims constitute thirty per cent as compared with fifty-nine per cent of Hindus. Before the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy, though religious feelings at times grew tense, they did not manifest themselves in the Legislature. In the present Legislative Assembly, however, things are different.

The Muslims of these Provinces were the first to organise themselves and enjoy the right of separate electorate in Municipalities and District Boards. Attempts to restrict the civil rights of Muslims through Municipal regulations or Legislative measures have not been so marked here as in some other provinces where the Muslims are in minority. So far they have been affected only by the general policy of the Congress Government.

Congress Flag

There have been many disputes at various places regarding the hoisting of the Congress flag on public buildings.

It became the general tendency among local bodies to pass resolutions in favour of hoisting the Congress or Muslim League flag on public buildings. In the Municipal Board of Cawnpore the Muslims raised a storm of protest when orders were issued asking all aided institutions to hoist the Congress flag on their buildings on pain of forfeiting their grants-in-aid. On the other hand, when in the Municipal Board of Bareilly a resolution was passed that the League flag be hoisted on Municipal buildings difficulties were placed in the way of hoisting the flag.

Communal Riots

There has been a crop of communal riots all over the province since the Congress came into power, the most serious being those at Pilibhit, Dadri, Pipra, Allahabad and Tanda. At Allahabad the situation still continues to cause anxiety.

Before going into details of these riots we give below a summary of the proceedings of the U.P. Legislative Assembly on the communal disturbances debate.

In moving the adjournment motion Mr Farooqi said that a section of irresponsible persons had created the impression that there was now Congress Raj and the majority party had become so much conscious of its power that it thought that it could do anything and commit any excesses without any protest from the minority.

Proceeding, he said that the whole mischief was caused by the circular of the Government that the district officials should consult the Congress Committees. This had resulted in demoralisation of the local officials and they could not take an independent attitude on delicate matters. Congressmen had taken up the position of non-official advisers to local officials. In the circumstances selfish people were utilising the situation to their own benefit or mischievous ends.

He added that communal clashes first started at Dadri. In Benares colour was thrown on some Muslims. He complained that adequate police arrangements were not made when processions were taken out. At Allahabad, too, there had been similar incidents. All this had happened because Government, by their action, had created a sense of insecurity and failed to maintain peace and order.

Mr Sampurnanand, Education Minister, said that he had risen to speak not because he was bursting with feelings but because he wanted to place certain facts before the House. The origin of the trouble as stated by the mover was quite incorrect. The trouble started in a clash between the two groups of Hindus on March 16, in which one Hindu was killed. Continuing, he said that it had been alleged that licence had been given to Congressmen to do whatever they desired and that was the cause of the present situation. To him it appeared, however, that a large number of irresponsible persons had brought about the present situation by fostering the view that the Congress Government could be bullied and brought to their knees by false propaganda.

Mr Mohammad Ishaque, supporting the motion, said that the charge that the whole trouble started with the Government circular to district officials was justified. Congressmen had begun thinking that they could do anything with impunity. Government's action in interfering with the day-to-day administration was responsible for the present situation.

The Minister of Justice said that it had been alleged that Government had failed to maintain law and order and that the genesis of all trouble had been the circular of Government to local officials. He asked whether the Opposition members had any direct information on the points from the 48 District Magistrates and Superintendents. He questioned the correctness of the statement. Irresponsible statements had been made by the League members. Incorrect statements were being published in the Urdu Press. A cry had been raised that Islam was in danger. Speeches had been made that Congress Raj was Hindu Raj and that Muslims should, if necessary, shed their blood. A campaign of lies was being carried on in the Urdu Press. Stories of kidnapping and murder, which had never happened, were being circulated. The minority community was taking advantage of Government's solicitude for the freedom of the Press and speech. He wished that they had dealt with such cases with strong hand. He pointed out that when a minister of this Government visited Cawnpore leaflets were distributed inciting the Muslims to murder him. Referring to the incident at Allahabad, he said that there would be a judicial inquiry into the matter, but the riot casualties showed that out of 12 persons killed, eight were Hindus and four Muslims. Day after day communal issues were raised in the Assembly and questions like the percentage of Muslims in various services were frequently asked. The result of fanning the communal feelings was what the Opposition

wanted. The adjournment motion had been brought not with the object of ventilating any grievance but to make a political capital out of it. He appealed to the members not to play with human lives which were dear and sacred to everyone.

Mr Aziz Ahmad (Muslim League) said that *if* instead of indulging in heated speeches they had tried to find out the root cause of the trouble the debate would have served a useful purpose. From his experience of Bareilly he could say that Congressmen were under the impression that their wishes could be defied by nobody. He alleged that Congressmen in Bareilly urged Hindus to observe hartal to protest against orders which were usually issued in previous years on such occasions. Referring to Allahabad he said that the Moharram passed off peacefully due to the restraint shown by the Muslims. During Moharram section 144, Cr. P. C. was promulgated but despite the fact that colour was thrown on hundreds of Muslims on March 16 and persons stabbed section 144, Cr. P. C. was not promulgated in Allahabad till March 17. He was of the opinion that the authorities had been demoralised and Congressmen were riding rough-shod over them.

Mr Zahiruddin Farooqi, replying, said that the speeches delivered on the other side gave him no hope of a solution of the problem. He alleged that the Congress people, intoxicated by power and thinking that they had brought the British Government to its knees, were bullying the minority. It was not correct to say that the minority was bullying the majority. The Minister of Justice had blamed only the Urdu Press for fanning the communal flame and had not apportioned any blame to the Hindi Press which was rankly communal in its outlook.

The Premier deeply deplored the motion. It had been asked what was the cause of communal tension. The debate of the evening illustrated it. It was the determination of the Opposition to create some sort of confusion and discredit Government. That was the key to the situation. Proceeding, the Premier said that unfortunately this year the Holi and Moharram fell on the same day. Added to this was the vigrous propaganda carried out by the Muslim League on communal basis. He did not dispute the League's right to carry on legitimate propaganda. But the League propaganda had gone to the extent of describing the Muslim members of Government as Kafirs. Referring to the firing at Allahabad, he said that it was better to risk injury to a few persons than to see a number of people massacred. He asked the permission of the House

to resort to firing more frequently in cases of communal riots.

Ballia

The following is the statement of Mr Rizwanullah, M.L.A. of Gorakhpur, who went to Ballia soon after the Dadri incident:

"I started for Ballia on behalf on the League on the evening of the 27th November and arrived in the morning of the 28th. I met a large number of persons from the public as well as from the gentry of the town and saw the District and Police authorities. I further made inquiries from members of the relief committee formed in this connection and had conversation with its president, Khan Bahadur Naziruddin Advocate. This work of relief, it will be known, has been organised under the District Muslim League, Ballia. As a result of my inquiry I wish to give out the following important facts connected with these occurrences:

"Every year the Katic Purnmashi, a big fair, is held some two miles from Ballia town at village Dadri. This fair is specially important for cattle dealings and a large number of good as well as inform and useless cattle are sold. The infirm and useless cattle are mostly sold by Hindus and purchased by Muslim butchers. This year too, as usual, a large number of useless bullocks and cows were purchased by butchers. A considerable number of such cattle were already removed from the fair by the butchers but about 2,000 cattle purchased were still there and for which arrangements were being made to despatch. They were within the market enclosures and roughly about Rs. 2,000 worth. The price of all these cattle was already paid to the sellers. Before they could be taken away, at about 10 a.m. on the 20th November, a large crowd of about a thousand well-armed Hindus attacked the butchers within the enclosure and beat them mercilessly, thus rendering the butchers unfit to protect their cattle. The assaulters took away all the cattle forcibly from the butchers' possession. A similar occurrence took place near the village Maldapur, about four miles from Ballia, at 2 p.m. and it is reported that a large number of butchers, of whom later on four were medically examined, were badly beaten and about more than a hundred cows snatched away. Another occurrence took place at Phaphna Railway Station (B. N. W. Railway) where late in the night, at about 10 a.m.,

in which about 190 heads of the cattle were seized from Railway wagons and taken away by the party. As a consequence three butchers received serious injuries.

"The total number of injured butchers in connection with these three occurrences come to more than forty of whom one succumbed to his injuries in the hospital. These butchers belong to Fyzabad, Jaupur, Azamgarh and Basti Districts. It is noteworthy in this connection that not a single Hindu is reported to have been attacked or injured.

In order to come to a better understanding of these occurrences it is necessary to note that a few days before the commencement of the Dadri fair meetings were organised in the neighbouring villages to preach cow protection (Gau Raksha) in which, it is alleged, responsible Congress workers took an active part. It is said that in the course of the attack at Dadri Mela the assaulters were raising cries of Jai in which they were repeating "Chittu Panday's (President of the District Congress Committee) Jai". It is strange to know that responsible Congress workers and volunteers and Sewa Samiti Volunteers were present in large numbers in the fair and none either cared to try to stop the occurrence or to help and relieve the injured.

"On this occasion the Congress and Sewa Samiti people have displayed an utter disregard of nationalistic spirit expected of them.

"I hope that the present Government would not fail to look with suspicion at the activities of the Ballia District Congressmen and would try to find out the realities underlying these occurrences. The District and Police authorities in Ballia no doubt rendered appreciable services in obtaining full control over the situation within the least possible time. No doubt the spirit of retaliation that had sprung in the Muslim masses at the sight of these ruthless attacks was pacified by the responsible Mussalmans and by the timely preventive measures adopted by the authorities to stop any further upheavals and clashes. It is proper that the present Government should strengthen the hands of the local authorities so that they may be able to make a complete and correct inquiry into the matter and may be successful in adequately punishing the offenders."

Mr Rizwanullah also waited in deputation on the Minister of Justice who visited the district soon after the incident and laid all these facts before him.

This incident was the first of its kind in the province and the silence of the Congress Ministry as well as the Provincial Congress organisation was very surprising for a truly national organisation should have made a prompt inquiry into the behaviour of its members and taken disciplinary action against them if the allegations were found correct.

Allahabad

To present the Allahabad riots in a true prospective, it is necessary to deal with the events that immediately preceded them and which had an important bearing on them. It is an open secret that soon after the Congress came into power efforts were made to re-start the celebration of Dassehra and other festivals at all places where the Hindus had given them up as a protest against the restrictions placed on such processions by the district authorities in order to assure peaceful celebrations. In the U.P. the services of the Muslim Parliamentary Secretaries were utilised to cajole the Muslims to agree to the lifting of these restrictions at several places. Allahabad was one of the cities where the Hindus had given up the celebration of Dassehra as a protest against the restrictions imposed by the district authorities.

Further, this year the Moharram, a month of intense mourning among the Muslims, coincided with the Holi, which is a festival of rejoining among the Hindus. It is thus clear that the celebration of these two religious festivals of different nature by the two communities, whose relations had already been strained due to the political atmosphere in the country, was fraught with grave dangers and required careful watch.

The Moharram started on March 4, 1938, and the Muslims of Allahabad requested the authorities that no marriage procession should be allowed on the streets which were used by the Moharram processions. This demand was based on an old convention in the City. The District Magistrate, however, refused to accede to this request. On March 6, while a marriage procession was passing in front of the Hospital some brick-bats were thrown on it by some unknown persons. Though the Muslims were prosecuted for this offence yet they were all acquitted. On March 7, the District Magistrate promulgated orders under section 144, Cr.P.C. which prohibited the carrying of more than 25 lathis with each of the Moharram processions. The public was further warned that the policy and military had been authorised to fire on rioters.

As a protest against the severity of these orders the

Muslims of Allahabad gave up the celebration of Moharram and the Muslim shop-keepers observed a hartal as a protest. It may be added here that the carrying of lathis has formed part of the Moharram processions at Allahabad since time immemorial. At this stage Mr Zahoor Ahmad M. L. A. intervened and after some other influential Muslims had given an undertaking, assuring the authorities of peaceful Moharram, celebrations the order under section 144, Cr. P. C. was withdrawn.

On March 12 (9th Moharram), while a Moharram procession was passing through Katra, the Hindus of the locality started a quarrel over a tazia and snatched it away from the Muslims. Some Hindus were arrested on the spot and the Muslims remained entirely peaceful in spite of this grave insult to their religious susceptibilities. Next day as the tazias were being carried to the Karbala, a large number of Hindus collected at the spot where the arrests had been made last night. They demanded the release of the Hindus arrested the previous night. The situation was tactfully handled by the Muslim leaders and the authorites and a breach of peace was averted.

The Moharram celebrations thus passed off peacefully and the District Magistrate, in a letter to Mr Zahoor Ahmad, M. L. A. acknowledged the assistance given by the latter in restarting the Moharram celebrations and settling many disputes during the celebrations that threatened a breach of peace. The District Magistrate, further appreciated the good behaviour of the Muslims at Katra on the night of the 9th Moharram when a tazia was snatched away and the restraint shown by them in spite of the grave provocation. The Magistrate further added that the promise made by the Muslims was faithfully carried out by them.

It is apparent from the above-mentioned facts that (1) the Muslims remained peaceful throughout and did not resort to violence even under grave provocation; (2) the influential and educated section of the Muslim community exerted itself in the cause of peace and succeeded in its efforts; (3) the attitude of the Hindus was militant and provocative; and (4) the Muslims, in spite of the fact that they were better organised during the Moharram never sought a quarrel.

The Holi Riots

The Holi celebrations started on March 15. In Allahabad, as in other places in the province, no coloured water is thrown on Muslims as they resent it on religious grounds. However, on

March 15, coloured water was thrown on one Mohammad Ismail of Shahgunj, as he was passing through the mohalla Bhartibhawan. Many other such complaints were made to the police by the Muslims of the city, who impressed on the Kotwal the necessity of imposing restrictions similar to those imposed on the Muslims during the Moharram under section 144, Cr. P. C. on the Hindus. The authorities paid no heed to these requests.

On March 17, a Holi procession was taken out in Allahabad and an unusually large number of Hindus (the official estimate was 800 to 1,000 persons) took part. Most of these persons were armed with lathis, another unusual thing for Holi processionists. Moreover, the Muslims alleged, that high caste Hindus treated the despressed classes with free drinks at the toddy shops and then took them in the procession. As it was entering Bahadurgunj the procession was intercepted by the police who asked it to change its route. The processionists thereupon took another route but started assaulting the Muslims. A young man, Shakir, was killed while a Muslim student was severely beaten. An old Muslim woman was severely beaten, too. In short, there was serious rioting.

Orders under section 144, Cr. P. C. were promulgated only in the evening. These orders did not empower the police or the military to fire, as was done during the Moharram, on the rioters. The very presence of such a large number of armed persons in the procession should have been enough to warn the authorities that the Hindus meant mischief. But no precautionary measures were taken by the authorities.

General rioting broke out on March 18 and there were numrerous cases of assaults and arson all over the city. The Hindus made organised raids on Muslim quarters and a glarin example of this was collection of a large number of Hindus in the mohalla Hatiya. But before they could do mischief, police help arrived and the situation was saved.

In these riots four Muslims were killed and forty-three injured were admitted to hospitals while the casualities among the Hindus were seven killed and thirty-seven injured.

As for the behaviour of the members of the two communities towards each other during the riots, it is not possible to make a general statement. We can, however, speak of a few cases which came to our knowledge during the course of our inquiry. The Zero Road is mostly inhabited by Hindus and many highly educated and respectable persons of this community live on this road. The office of the Allahabad City Congress

Committee is also located here. The house of Mr R.S. Pathak, Secretary of the Congress Committee, Mr Kedar Nath, a leading Mukhtar, and Mr Rameshwar Prasad, an Honorary Magistrate, are also situated on this road. It was in this quarter that one Muslim, Mohsin, who was going to see his injured brother in the hospital, was attacked by Hindus and killed at about 10 a.m. on March 19. The crime was committed near the house of the Congress Secretary and the house of Mr Rameshwar Prasad too was not more than 20 paces from the place of the accident.

On the other hand, in the Attala mohalla, which is a predominantly Muslim quarter (the inhabitants being Muslim butchers and Ansaries), not a single Hindu was molested. In fact, some of the Hindu inhabitants of the mohalla, who thought themselves unsafe, were given shelter by the Muslims in their own houses. A poster issued by the Hindus of this locality fully bears out the brotherly treatment meted out to them by the Muslims. Similarly, nothing happened to the Hindus of the mohallas Thanpur and Akbarpur where the Muslims were in majority.

Another regrettable incident, which has been repeated twice within a period of obout six months, was the pollution of a mosque by throwing a pig's head into it. It is incidents like this that embitter the relations between the two communities and lead to rioting.

We also learnt with regret that the Hindus of Allahabad resorted to an economic boycott of the Muslims. If this boycott is persisted in, it is bound to further strain the relations between the two communities.

Benares

The Committee visited Benares twice and spent four days in collecting evidence. The relations between the Hindus and the Muslims in Benares had been strained since March 1938. At the time of Bakr-Id hand-written posters were stuck on walls and electric poles in which Muslims were asked not to indulge in cow sacrifice, and in case they disregarded these directions, they were threatened that their lives would be in danger and their property and houses would be looted and burnt. One such poster was sent by the Secretary of the Muslim League to the District authorities. The District Magistrate held a public meeting in which both the communities were asked to maintain peace, and a peace committee, consisting of influential members of both the

communities, was appointed to carry on propaganda for the maintenance of law and order. Peace was thus maintained during the celebration of Bakr-Id but the heart-burning which had been generated continued as before. On the night of the 9th of Moharram, a tazia procession was taken out with great pomp. When this procession, after starting from mohalla Shewala, reached Khari Kuan the leaders of the processions were injured by thorns and pieces of broken glasses which had been scattered on the road. The volunteers of the Muslim League swept the land with their clothes and only then the procession could proceed after long delay. The District authorities who accompanied the procession witnessed the incident themselves. This act of cruelty was naturally attributed to some Hindus and this further embittered the relations between the two communities. The third incident in the same direction ocurred when the Hindus objected to the Muslims putting their tazia, called the tazia of Baqar Hussain, in the river from the Ghat. The practice was that this tazia instead of being buried, as is usual, was thrown into the river from the Ghat. This year the Hindus objected to it and the trouble was averted only through the efforts of the authorities. These incidents and others revealed that the relations between the communities were anything but friendly and the feelings could be inflamed even by some slight incident.

The Holi celebrations began from March 15. In Benares the Hindus generally, since the acceptance of office by the Congress, asserted that Swaraj, in other words Ram Raj, had been established. The men in the street thought that the Muslims were their subjects, and could treat them in whatever manner they liked. Consequently the Hindus of the goonda type began to bully, even molest, the Muslim wayfarers. Upto the evening of March 15, the situation had not grown worse, but on this evening a Muslim named Mukhtar Ahmad, son of Muhammad Yusuf, a resident of mohalla Bhika Shah Phalwan, went to the house of Mahabir Rastogi, in mohalla Thakruran, to realise his wages. Near the house of Rastogi he found an injured Muslim lying on the road. He tried to find out what the matter was. In the meantime several Muslims wanted to find out what the matter was. In the meantime several Hindus arrived and began to belabour him with lathis. He was injured, though his injuries were simple. A report of the incident was duly lodged in the police station by Mukhtar Ahmad on the morning of March 16. The injured man found by Mukhtar was a resident of mohalla Madanpura and was a weaver by

caste, but as Mukhtar forgot his name he could not be traced. It is to be particularly noted that at the time when this incident took place no general riot had broken out and hence the Hindu mob, which had begun attacking the Muslim wayfareres, show their feelings towards the Muslim community.

On the morning of March 16 there was a fight between two Hindu parties in which one Raja Ram was stabbed fatally. Rumour went round that there was a communal riot. Although this rumour was strongly contradicted, it upset the balance of mind of the excited mob all the same and the feelings of hatred, which had already been existing, became uncontrollable. On the same morning a Holi procession was organised which was accompanied by Hindus armed with lathis. It also contained horses and donkies and people with their faces and clothes coloured and blackened rode on them. The processionists not only induled in throwing coloured water on the passersby but also mud and filthy water of the Municipal drains was being thrown indiscriminately. This procession, shrieking, shouting and indulging in all sorts of offensive manners proceeded slowly. The history of the procession is that it started some years ago, but it was never made to pass through any mohalla inhabited by Muslims. Again it is a long established custom in Benares that coloured water is never thrown on Muslims, if it is thrown, ever by chance, on any Muslim he very strongly resents it. This year this particular procession did not discriminate between a Muslim and a Hindu in throwing coloured water. The procession reached the mohalla Qazipura Kalan, and stopped in front of the house of a Teli, who entertained the processionists. Here also coloured water was thrown on Muslims and the face of a Muslim boy was blackened forcibly. This was naturally resented by the boy. An altercation followed which attracted some other Muslims who joined in the protest. At this place the Hindu processionists attacked the Mussalmans with lathis. After this the riot spread throughout the city like wild fire. In the beginning only the Muslims were injured but later on the Hindus also received injuries. But no open fight between the parties took place. Scattered attacks were made and in many cases persons were stabbed in lonely streets. Altogether 82 injured Muslims were admitted to the hospital and four were killed, and 73 Hindus were admitted into the hospital and seven were killed. The reason for this high role of casualities is that in Benares knives were freely used. Sporadic cases of assault continued for several days, but as the police were careful and military were called out at an early stage the situation came under control soon. On March 16, a student of

the Hindu University was injured at about 12 noon while two others who had gone out were supposed by the students to have been killed. Several hundred students of the Benares University, armed with lathis and sticks and shouting slogans like "blood for blood" came out of the University, and began to roam about in search of Muslims. The Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate promptly reached the spot and with the greatest possible difficulty controlled the situation. The students were taken back by the authorities to the boarding house where the Superintendent of Police was informed that some students had confined a Muslim in a room with the object of killing him.

The Superintendent of Police persuaded the students to release the Muslim, but they denied that anyone had been confined. After a long discussion the Superintendent threatened to search the boarding house unless the Muslim was released. On this one Ghulam Rasool, a tonga driver, was released from one of the rooms. This man, who had lost all hope of release and was expecting to be butchered any minute, was extremely terrified at the time of release.

During the riots the Hindu members of the Congress adopted a partisan attitude towards their co-religionists which annoyed even those Muslims who had joined the Congress. These Muslims are now convinced that the Congress is a part and parcel of the Mahasabha and have, therefore, left it and have joined the Muslim League. They now believe that it is impossible for any Congress Muslim to be of any service to his community.

Before the riot in Benares broke out the relations between the Hindus and the Muslims had become very strained and the atmosphere had been prepared to make a riot possible on the slighest provocation. The responsible sections of both communities tried their best to imporve the relations but the mob could not be controlled and created mischief.

Sitapur

Mr Ehasanur Rahman Kidwai, Secretary of the U.P. Muslim League, Mr Mobashir Hosain Kidwai, Secretary of the U.P. Muslim League Party, and Mr Ali Bahadur Habibullah, member of the Central Muslim League Organising Committee, visited the Pipra village immediately after receiving news of a riot there. They issued a statement which showed the attitude of the Hindu community in Sitapur district.

As the matter is subjudice we refrain from entering into its details.

Pilibhit

Mr Karimur Raza Khan, M.L.A., who was co-opted a member of the Committee, conducted an inquiry into the riot at Raipur in Pilibhit district and the following is his report:

The causes that led to the riot at Raipur in Pilibhit district were not communal but the trouble took a communal turn later on. Parties to the riot were Hindus and Muslims. Raipur is a small village in police station Barkhaira, Bisalpur tehsil. The population of the village consists of weavers, Manihars and barbers who do no cultivation. Most of the members of the League were residents of Paotha and Khamarya. Very few from other villages had joined the Muslim League. Up till April 1938 only seven persons were enrolled as members of the League.

Bazaar is held twice a week in Paotha. The profit of the bazaar goes to the Paotha zamindars, who are Muslims. In July 1937, the month in which the Congress assumed office of the U.P., a bazaar was started by the Hindu zamindars of Raipur in their own village to defeat the Paotha bazaar. In spite of persuasion, intimidation and coercion from the Hindu zamindars and Hindu inhabitants of that locality, the Muslims of Raipur continued attending the Paotha bazaar. This led to strained relations between the Muslims and Hindus as the Hindus wanted to see their own bazaar flourshing and could not tolerate this attitude of the Muslims. They had expected that the Muslims would always act according to the wishes of the Hindus of Raipur.

On March 15, 1938, there was some altercation between one Mahabat Shah and his son on the one hand and Abdur Rahim and other Muslims of Raipur on the other, but actual clash was averted. Apprehending troubles in the near future and finding themselves helpless, the Muslims of Raipur decided to shift to Khamarya village for good. They approached Khan Bahadur Imtiaz Ahmad, M.L.A. and other zamindars who lent them some bullock carts and men from Khamarya to help them in removing their householed belongings. They started removing their luggage in the morning and when some of the luggage had been removed from Raipur, the Hindus of that village tried to stop them forcibly. About thirty Muslims

were attacked by the Hindus who were about ten times more in numbers. Meanwhile Hindus from neighbouring villages had also arrived in a large number. The leader of this party had a naked sword in his hand.

The most unfortunate feature of the riot was that the local Congressmen helped in procuring and arranging prosecution evidence when the case came up in Court.

Local Congressmen were present during the investigations. That the Muslims had a right to leave Raipur cannot be disputed. The Hindus had no justification in obstructing them. Why they took to this course? Obviously, they thought that, they were safe and could stop the Muslims by force with the help of the so-called Congressmen of that locality.

Other Riots

Mr Aziz Ahmad Khan, M.L.A. who was co-opted a member of the Inquiry Committee, reported as follows after an inquiry:

Bijnor

The village Musapur in tehsil Mehthaur of Bijnor district is inhabited by a large majority of Hindus and the Muslims form only a small minority. The Muslim population is concentrated in one locality. The Muslim inhabitants have built a mosque for which they are involved in litigation with the Hindu landlord. It is alleged that the agent of the zamindar made it a communal question, though the question really relates only to the relationship between the zamindar and the tenant. On March 15, 1938, a Holi procession was arranged and it proceeded through the streets inhabited by Muslims. It was the first occasion when the Congress flag was carried along with the Holi procession. A few Muslims objected to the procession being led through those streets and it appears that this caused some trouble. It is alleged that in the afternoon a crowd of Hindus gathered. The Muslims shut themselves in their houses where, it is said, they were attacked. Marks and stains of blood inside the houses were found by Mr Aziz Ahmad Khan when he went to make the inquiry. The number of Muslims admitted into hospital was sixteen males and three females.

Cawnpore

The incident that occurred in connection with the visit of the Hon'ble Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, Minister of Communications, has already appeared in the papers. An official inquiry

has also been made. We think that this incident is an instance of the over-enthusiasm of the Muslim supporters of the Congress in demonstrating the popularity of the Ministers.

Banda

During Holi at Banda, coloured water was thrown on the Muslims, a mosque was desecrated and a house was set on fire.

Gorakhpur

In the village Gujaikol, Gorakhpur district, a whole Muslim family was butchered and burnt in December 1937.

Etah

On a very insignificant matter a riot took place at Repura village, Aligunj tehsil, Etah district. Hindus assaulted the Muslims with lathis and one Muslim, named Tahir, was killed and many were injured.

Bulandshahr

Serious complaints were made before the Inquiry Committee about the vindictive tactics adopted by Congressmen against Muslims of Bulandshahr district. It was alleged that after the bye-election in this district the supporter of the League were placed under an effective social ban and had to undergo other hardships. Complaints were received that the supporters of the League had been forcibly prevented from drawing water from public wells.

Basti

There is a pucca mosque in the village Mianpur, tehsil Domariagunj in Basti district. On the Holi day a crowd of Hindus entered the mosque and took away the wood which was collected there, loading it on bullock-carts. They set fire to this wood. Next day the khalyan (barn) of wheat of a Muslim was also burnt.

Madras Presidency

Muslims form only seven per cent of the total population of the Madras Presidency. They are mostly concentrated in Malabar where their strength is as high as one-third of the population. The Moplahs are educationally very backward and the previous Government had adopted special measures for their education. These, as will appear in the following pages, have been either totally given up or partially suspended by the Congress Government. We give below the details of injustices done to the Muslims of this Province by the Congress Government.

Local Bodies

According to the Local Boards and Municipalities Act, 25 per cent seats are reserved for minorities including Muslims, depressed classes, Anglo-Indians, Christians and women, but of this only two or three seats are reserved for Muslims, whereas, according to the population basis, they deserve more. The cases of Malabar, Kurnool, South Kanara, Bellary and Cuddapah illustrate how the Muslim community is under represented. Whereas the Muslim population of Malabar is 32·9 per cent, their representation in the district is only 17 per cent. The following table gives the percentage of population and representation of Muslims in other districts:

District	Population	Representation
Kurnool	13·2	7·7
South Kanara	12·8	6·8
Bellary	10·6	6·2
Cuddapah	13·1	8·8

Even in the Corporation of Madras, although the Muslim population is 11 per cent Muslims got only three out of a total of 45 seats in the last election, whereas there were seven Muslims out of 30 elected members in the previous Council. In order to remove this inequality and to secure adequate representation for Muslims in Municipalities and District Boards a Bill was introduced in the Legislature by Muslims to have separate electorate on population basis with a minimum of 15 per cent. The Congress Government refused to give permission to introduce this Bill.

Recently the Government has increased the number of members in various District Boards. They have not given a single seat more to the Muslims in these boards. On the other hand, they have so redistributed the existing Muslim seats in these District Boards as to render them ineffective from the point of view of Muslim representation.

The Ministry of Local Administration has been doing its utmost to reduce the Muslim majority into a minority in some of the Panchayats so that they may elect Hindus as their chairmen.

According to the Administration Report of the Local Boards in Malabar for the year 1935-36 the number of Muslim members in the Malabar District Board was 13, while the number of members, when the Congress is in power, in the said Board is only 10.

Services

The last Government had a scheme of reotation according to which out of twelve appointments two were given to Muslims. The present Government (Congress) wanted to abolish communal representation in the services. But it could not succeed in doing so against the strong public opinion amongst Non-Brahamans and Muslims. In spite of the fact that the policy of communal representation in the services is retained, the Muslims are not getting their due share in departments such as Medical and Engineering. Various methods have been adopted by the Congress Government to circumvent this communal Government order. The Madras Public Service Commission, which is expected to keep the balance among the vatious communities in the matter of recruitment according to this communal Government Order can do so only if the Government notifies vacancies. The Government in the various departments, by filling in vacancies for long periods on a temporary basis and by the appointment of Brahmans, prevents Muslims from getting their legitimate share in the appointments. In the Secretariat about 30 Brahman clerks were appointed on a temporary basis for a long period and were later made permanent by the present Government on the plea that these men had acquired a claim by working for a long period. The other method that is employed for preventing Muslims from getting appointment is by reducing the maximum age for various posts and by raising the standard of qualifications.

Education

One of the most important recommendations of the Committee appointed by the previous Government was the introduction of religious instruction for Muslims in schools and colleges. That Government accepted this recommendation along with others but in the name of economy a good number of Muslim schools are now being closed down.There are many Muslim secondary schools under private Management which can only exist on equipment grant from the Government.Such grants have been denied to these schools, although the same Government has given a grant of several lakhs to the Pachorppas College, a purely Hindu institution, whose doors are completely closed to Muslim students. Even with regard to the Muslim orphanage similar treatment is meted out.

Admission of Muslim students in arts and professional colleges in the province used to be very difficult till the last Government appointed selection committees, including a Muslim representative on them. The selection committees were able to secure admission of Muslim students into these colleges. The

Congress Government has abolished these selection committees with the result that admission of Muslim students is considerably restricted.

The Malabar District Board by a resolution, which it recently passed, resolved upon a ten-year plan for amalgamation of all special schools with general schools, with the result that after ten years no Moplah school will be in existence.

Then the Standing Committee of the District Board of Malabar at its meeting, held on August 15, 1938, decided to abolish 73 schools on the ground that they were uneconomic. Of these, as many as 58 are Moplah schools. If sufficient opportunity had been given to these schools to justify their existence perhaps none of them would have been abolished. The proposal of the Committee has been approved by the District Board.

Under an order from the Government the Malabar District Board abolished the posts of Conductors and Conductresses in Moplah schools. These persons were part-time teachers of Quran in the schools and also effective propagandists for attracting pupils to the schools. Their abolition has worked as a great setback to the increase of Moplah pupils, specially Moplah girls.

There are Arabic Pandits in some of the High Schools under the Malabar District Board. Some months back the Board issued an order to the effect that ten posts of these Pandits would be abolished in all schools which have less than 20 students in the secondary stage, knowing full well that the Moplahs are extremely backward in the matter of secondary education and that the minimum insisted on by the Board would never be secured in most of the schools.

Communal Riots

Comparatively speaking there have been fewer riots in Madras Presidency than in other Congress-governed provinces. Besides the Choolai riot (on which we reproduce the statement of Mr S.A.W. Bukhari below) there have been communal outbreaks at two or three other places and it was represented to us that the sufferers in these riots were mostly Muslims.

The following are the relevant extracts from the statement of Syed Abdul Wahab Bukhari, M.L.A., on the communal riot at Choolai, Madras:

The first communal riot in Choolai (Madras) started on April 27, 1937, on Strahan's Road near the Saraswathi Talkies. The trouble started on a trifling matter. The Hindus were carry-

ing a procession of their local deity when at about 11-30 p.m. a Muslim boy, who happened to be in the crowd, was roughly handled by the mob. Some others came to his rescue and the processionists, being in large numbers, overwhelmed the few Muslims, making free use of stones and brickbats. A Muslim hotel was looted and its bottles were used as missiles. The police got the situation in hand at about 2 a.m. This was the beginning of the trouble. Then riots occurred on August 16, 1937, and on October 2, 1937. During these months an actual state of guerilla war existed, resulting in loss of life and cessation of normal business for a long time.

In all about 250 Muslims were injured and as compared to this the number of Hindus wounded was very small.

Orissa

Almost all Muslim inhabitants of Orissa are the descendants of the original invaders and consequently retain their own language and culture. They speak and write Urdu. During the unsettled conditions and misrule that existed before the annexation of the province by the British, the Muslim aristocracy stood by the Oriya people. Orissa came under the British rule in 1803 and formed part of Bengal. Then it was amalgamated with Bihar. The condition of the Muslims remained more or less unchanged, though after its transfer to Bihar the Muslims could not remain in touch with the headquarters of the Provincial Government. Still their condition was much better than it is now after its separation.

Relations between Communities

The communal relations were amicable in the Province for several years. The Muslim population is mostly concentrated in towns and only a few families are scattered in rural areas. Though there have been no communal riots recently yet there have been complaints that certain persons who called themselves Congress workers started propaganda at Nischint-ka Hat (20 miles from Cuttack) against the sale of cows to the Muslims. It is stated that these workers and their sympathisers molested the Muslim butchers who had gone there to purchase cows from Agrahat and even tried to take possession of their animals by force. No report was made in the police.

Education

The Muslims are economically poor and educationally backward. They have not many schools of their own. In primary schools children are allowed to choose either of the two languages,

Oriya and Urdu. But in aided schools only Oriya is recognised as the medium of instruction and no provision is made for Muslim students who want to learn the Urdu language. Even in several Government schools attempts have been made and are being made to force the Muslim students to take up the Oriya language and numerous complaints have been made to us of indirect pressure being brought upon the Muslims to fall in. The arrangements for the teaching of Urdu are almost negligible. Out of a total number of 181 schools in the province, there is only one institution in which the medium of instruction is Urdu. This places the Muslim students at a disadvantage in competition with other students inasmuch as the Muslims have to learn one more language in addition to Urdu and English.

73

Report of the Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League to Examine the Wardha Scheme

The Wardha Scheme is really the working of Mr Gandhi's ideas of Education. The framers of the scheme at the very outset acknowledged his leadership and paid a tribute to the whole-hearted devotion with which he threw himself into the task of evolving a system of education which might be in harmony with the genius of the Indian people and solve the problem of mass education in a practical way and within as short a time as possible. The basic idea of his scheme, as expounded by him in his articles in the Harijan and at the Wardha Educational Conference, is that education, if it is to be sound in its principles, should be imparted through some craft or productive work, which should from the nucleus of all other instructions imparted in the school. This craft, if taught efficiently and thoroughly, should enable the school to pay towards the cost of its teaching staff. According to him, this would also help the State to introduce immediately the scheme of free and compulsory basic education, the cost of which otherwise, in the existing political and financial condition of the country, would be prohibitive.

Writing in the Harijan of October 2, 1937, Mr Gandhi says:

"Having spoken strongly in 1920 against the present system of education, and having now got the opportunity of influencing, however little it may be, Ministers in seven provinces, who have been fellow-workers and fellow-sufferers in the glorious struggle

for freedom of the country, I have felt an irresistable call to make good the charge that the present mode of education is radically wrong from bottom to top. And what I have been struggling to express in these columns very inadequately has come upon me like a flash, and the truth of it is daily growing upon me."

Speaking at the All-India National Education Conference Dr Zakir Hussain pointed out that many educationists had been trying to make some manual work the central idea of education. This method is called the Project Method in America and the Complex Method in Russia.

Non-Violence

Mr Gandhi in his inaugural speech drew the attention of the audience to the fundamental principles of his plan of self-supporting primary education, (p. 71, Education Reconstruction):

"If we want to eliminate communal strife, we must start with foundations pure and strong, by rearing our younger generation on the education I have adumbrated. That plan springs out of non-violence. We have to make them true representatives of our culture, our civilisation, and the true genius of our nation. Europe is no example to us. It plans its programme in terms of violence because it believes in violence. I would be the last to minimise the achievement of Russia, but the whole structure is based on force, and violence. If India has resolved to eschew violence, this system of education becomes an integral point of the discipline she has to go through. We cannot and will not think in terms of exploitation and we have no other alternative but this plan of education which is based on non-violence."

Mr K.G. Mashruwala threw further light on the subject in his article in the Harijan (December 7, 1937). He said:

"The system of primary education is the application of the law of non-violence in the training of the child as a prospective citizen of the world. Its aim is to make the child share the obligations of citizenship from the earliest age at which it begins to show some power of discrimination. The school will be the centre for the radiation of culture to the surrounding society."

The Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Education appointed to consider the Wardha Scheme approved it with insignificant alterations.

The ideas of educating children through some dubitable form of productive work has found favour with modern educationists and the principle is commedable.

In our opinion, an examination of the basic principles of the scheme is absolutely essential in order to gauge the effect of the scheme on the language, culture, and religious tradition of Muslims.

A system of primary education has been adopted in some countries as a means of wiping out the separate identity of various communities and welding them into a corporate State, as well as to propagate the political and economic principles of the party in control of the machinery of the state, and for the state, and for the conversion of the youth to the ideals of the party.

Mr Gandhi in his inaugural speech at the Wardha Conference said:

"Legislation, if it was necessary in this respect, would not be compulsory as it could not be passed without the consent of the majority of our representatives."

Those who have the experience of the working of the legislature in the Congress Provinces are familiar with the callous disregard shown to the Muslim representatives. We need hardly emphasise that the legislations are carried without giving due weight to the opinions of Muslims. The experience gained in totalitarian states shows that the culture and separate individual existence of minority nation has been undermined by a system of education and the Muslim youth would be then converted without apparent use of force to the Congress creed by the introduction of a similar system.

The history of the successful conversion of the youth in Turkistan is well-known. We think it will not be out of place here to give a brief account of the method and results of the system of education based on the political ideology of parties in certain other countries. We shall then take up the Wardha Scheme and examine how far its ideals would tend to obliterate or weaken the religious traditions and culture of the Indian Muslims, so that they may lose their separate national identity and be moulded according to the political ideals of the Congress.

Education in Modern Russia

The process of socialising and mechanising Russia under the new economic policy and five-year plan received great impetus from the educational and propagandist activities of the Communist dictatorship. Lenin and Stalin and thier chief associates in the Communist Party understood perfectly well that unless the mass of workers and peasants were inspired with an enthusiasm for the new order, mere decrees of the Soviet

Government would be without a lasting effect. Socialistically trained citizenship was as necessary as the economic plan. The universities and educational societies were purged of scholars unsympathetic to the Communist creed and were staffed with persons willing to interpret the various subjects according to Marxian principles. The masses could not be safely allowed to divide their allegiance between a materialism sponsored by the Communists and the spiritualism preached by the clergymen. Communism, in fact, aimed at destroying the influence of religion. The party was organised and aimed at ousting religion and was an eager preacher of a new dispensation throughout Russia. Its importance lay not only in its control of the Soviet Government and its direction or policies but also in its missionary work among the masses, getting them to accept the communist aims and to co-operate loyally in their achievement. To this end the party strove and paid special attention to the conversion of the youth of the land. The object of mass education was not only the ensuring of needful literacy in the nation but also the conversion of the rising generation to Communism. Consequently, the Russian masses were becoming literate in the same proportion in which they were being converted to Communism.

Education in Italy

In Fascist Italy measures were taken to use education as a means of gaining mass support. Great stress was laid in the schools on training in citizenship, Fascist Citizenship. The teachers had Fascist sympathies and the curricula and text books were all based on Fascist principles. For many, moreover, Fascist training in the schools was supplemented by similar training in the Party's auxiliary organisation for youth. Nationalism was continually emphasized and extolled by the Fascist leaders. Italians were repeatedly reminded of their past greatness and future hopes as a nation. It is in relation to learning and scholarship that the claims of totalitarian states make themselves felt with the greatest insistence. These states do not hesitate to invoke the idealistic theory of the state in order to identify the convenience of the party in power with that of the state.

We must bear in mind that the principle of leadership is a distinctive feature of Fascist philosophy. All artistic, sporting and cultural movements having their origin in the spiritual requirements of the people are united under the direction of the party organisation which encourages and co-ordinates their existence. These are not the only activities, however, which constitute the formative capacity in the moral and intellectual field of the National Fascist Party. The control of the party over

the working of the Fascist Institute of Culture guarantees a Fascist policy in the working of this body. It is the real trustee of the education of the New Italian. The party exercises a decisive influence in the formation of an undivided national conscience. The school and youth movements aim, above all, at the forming of good citizens. In Fascist Italy, the people and the army are one; for every soldier is conscious of his duties as a citizen and every citizen is a soldier in civilian dress.

That a missionary zeal is an essential condition for the success of a scheme is amply borne out by the example of the totalitarian states. It is claimed by the supporters of Fascism that it is a spiritual creed, demanding unquestioned faith and ardour from its adherents. "If Fascism is not a creed, how could it endow its followers with courage and stoicism." (Mussolini).

Basic Creed of Wardha Scheme

In our opinion only that system of education can be taken to be acceptable both to Hindus and Muslims which allows complete freedom of thought and freedom to express ideas, freedom to discuss the ideas expressed, freedom to teach the truth as the teacher sees it, and freedom to search for the truth and to proclaim it. Keeping this in view, it is necessary that teachers of all classes, religions and political creeds should be employed.

We also want to point out that the distinction between common citizenship and common nationality should not be lost sight of and the system of education should be based on liberal principles where no particular political creed or philosophy is given undue predominance. The principle of non-violence on which the Wardha Scheme is based, has been conceived by the political philosophy of the Muslim nation differently. Non-violence to them is not the absolute and final truth but has been accepted by them as valid under a certain condition. We shall point out in its proper place how emphasis has been laid on the superiority of non-violence.

We are in no way condemning the doctrine of non-violence, but in an educational scheme there must be scope for teaching different forms of political doctrines. If from their childhood boys and girls are make to think in terms of the superiority of non-violence, it may produce the same results as the doctrine of superiority of race has done in certain totalitarian states.

To base an education scheme on the creed of a leader of a political party is to import a method of education that finds favour in totalitarian states and is clearly contrary to the sound principles of education. This will involve giving education a religious garb. It will clearly imply the welding of two nations

in one synthetic culture by means of a system of primary education and will only faciliate the conversion of the youth to the ideas of the Congress. Unless it is possible for education to be imparted on lines, where there is room for other ideals to flourish, this scheme of education cannot be accepted and the Muslim institutions will have to be separated.

Whatever may be one's opinion regarding the merits or demerits of the system of education in totalitarian states, we think that in a country like India, a land of various nationalities, only that system of education can be successful which is calculated to make a person understand the society of which he is a part and to create a great body of skilful people who would be tolerant of other people's views. A system of education which emphasises the superiority of one political ideal over others will encourage intolerance. We have seen how this sort of education and belief in the superiority of the National Socialist creed has resulted in the imposition of disabilities on the Jews. The fact has to be faced that the Muslims and Hindus are destined to live together in this country and the most suitable system of education is that which inculcates in them toleration and mutual respect.

Hindustani

In our view, the Wardha Scheme is definitely calculated to prevent and circumscribe the progress of the Urdu language and the Urdu script; for the scheme contemplates making Hindustani a compulsory subject in order to provide a *lingua franca* for India. But the word Hindustani is extremely misleading. At first it seemed to singnify the Urdu language as it is ordinarily spoken in Northern India and was defined as such by certain Congress leaders. But soon it became clear that by Hindustani, Mr Gandhi did not mean Urdu but a language which was neither Urdu nor Hindi and which did not exist at present and has yet to be created.

This change in the meaning of the term Hindustani has not been due to individual caprice but is the result of a definite policy initiated by the High Command of the Congress. Thus under the garb of Hindustani and the cover of the ideal of one language for India, it is Hindi that the Wardha Scheme contemplates to impose on Muslims. This is the strongest blow that can be dealt to the Urdu language, and it is a prospect which cannot be looked upon with equanimity by anyone who has the interest of Muslim culture at heart.

The ever-changing definition of Hindustani, leads us to the suspicion that with the Urdu language, the repository of Muslim

culture, will also go with the Urdu script, because a script is adequate only for the language for which it has been adopted. The Urdu script will soon be found inadequate for the new *lingua franca* of India, and, therefore, unnecessary and burden some. And, secondly, the forces that are aiming at eliminating the Urdu language will work with additional momentum to eliminate the Urdu script, and with greater chances of success. The time will soon come when it will be generally recognised that the Indian child should be relieved of the burden of having to learn two scripts Urdu and Deonagari—and that the Urdu script, which is not the script of the language of the majority of the country, can safely be omitted as an integral part of national education.

In countries peopled by more than one nation speaking different languages never has an attempt been made to evolve a new language common to both. The language of the minority has been duly safeguarded by its definite recognition. The Flemish language has only recently been recognised in Belgium. We, therefore, think that the solution of the problem lies in recognising the Urdu language as the mother-tongue of the Muslims of India.

Mother-Tongue

It has been asserted that the present system of education does not meet the requirements of the country in any shape or form. English having been made the medium of instruction in all the higher branches of learning, it has created a permanent gulf between the highly educated few and the uneducated many. It has prevented knowledge from percolating into the masses; the excessive importance given to English has cast upon the educated classes a burden which has maimed them mentally for life and has made them strangers to their own land. As one's mother-tongue is the foundation of all education, we recommend that in the case of Muslim boys, their mother-tongue, namely Urdu, should be employed.

A book with technical terms and Sanskrit words will not be any the more intelligible to the Muslims because it is written in Persian script.

Special emphasis has been laid on the importance of Hindustani (see page 165) as a national language, and it has been described as the most important product of the cultural contact of Muslims and Hindus (page 29). Some recent utterances of Congress leaders have only tended to that a non-existent language is sought to be forced on India. The advocacy of the more frequent use of Sanskrit by the Minister of Education, U.P. and its acceptance by the Congress High Command so

that it may be intelligible to people of all provinces is an example of the attitude of Congress leaders.

We may also state that it is not possible to point out any scientific literature that will conform with the definition of such literature given by certain Congress leaders. The scientific books that exist in the Urdu language at present contain technical terms adopted mostly from Arabic and Persian. It will be educationally wasteful and unsound to replace this rich store of technical terms by forcibly coined Sanskrit technical terms which will be totally unintelligible to the Muslims even if written in Persian script.

The absence of literature in Hindustani will place the students under a great difficulty and after leaving school they will not be able to add to their knowledge by further study. If the state undertakes the production of books in a language which does not exist at present and the source and derivation of the technical terms of which is not known, it will result in impeding the progress of literary production in the existing languages.

Propagation of Party Ideals

Before making a brief review of the syllabus provided under the Wardha Scheme, we must pursue further the question as to how far the scheme will help the propagation of the political, cultural and social ideas of the Congress and tend to weaken and ultimately obliterate the religious traditions and culture of Indian Muslims.

The scheme lays down a course in geography and civics and in current events, combined with a reverential study of the different religions of the world, trying to show how in essentials they are in perfect harmony. Stress is also laid on the gradual movement towards greater political and cultural unity. The history of great liberators of mankind and their victories is to find a prominent place in the curriculum. Moreover, emphasis is laid on lessons drawn from life, showing the efficacy of non-violence in all its phases. The teaching of the history of national awkening in India and celebrations of national festivals and national weeks are to form a feature of the life of every school.

If training classes are opened to pupils of all political creeds and principles and all religions it may be possible that this course of study may work successfully. The reverential study of different religions of the world would be meaningless if the students are brought to believe in the superiority of

non-violence as a creed over all other creeds. The experiment made in totalitarian states for teaching the superiority of one race or of a particular political philosophy has created a spirit of aggressiveness in those states and we fear that emphasis on the creed of non-violence to the exclusion of all others would have a similar effect here.

Kaka Sahib Kalikar, speaking at the meeting of the All-India National Education Conference at Wardha said:

"I began to take active interest in national education in 1907. In the beginning, I used to think that the aim of national education was to create revolutionaries. Later I found that it was impossible to have such revolutionaries unless there was a strong wave of patriotism throughout the country. The aim of national education, therefore, I thought was to create patriots. My experience taught me that patriotism could not be created without a study of national culture. Thus, the idea of national education became wider and deeper."

Mr K.G. Mashroowala, writing in the Harijan of April 20, 1937, remarked:

"The school will be the centre for the radiation of culture to the surrounding society. The principle underlying the system has been described as the application of the law of non-violence in the training of children as prospective citizens of the world."

Here we may note that education in citizenship on the basis of the political creed of the party is one of the chief features of the Fascist system of education. Under the Wardha Scheme also the conception of citizenship is correlated with the doctrine of non-violence.

Syllabus Detailed—The History of Islam in India

The whole subject is treated as follows:

1. The Development of Indo-Muslim Culture: Such heroes have been chosen as give a particular colour to history.

2. Amir Khusro, Kabir, Guru Nanak, Akbar and Dara Shikoh have been chosen. This, in our opinion, will give only a one-sided view of the Muslim history, where as Hindu heroes like Harsha, Prithvi Raj, Sivaji, Ranjit Singh and others find a prominent place. Those persons who attempted to propound a new religion out of Hinduism and Islam have been presented as Muslim saints and sages, while those with purely Islamic, outlook have been totally ignored.

Further, the whole of Muslim History, which is full of achievements and world-wide upheavals has been broken up

into very insignificant and unimportant portions. A very large number of Muslim heroes, with unparalleled achievements in various spheres of life, have been left out. Where as the teaching of Satyagraha as a world force will form an important part of the syllabus. For the sake of camparison, we give a corresponding Fascist view of the universality of their creed:

"Today I hold that Fascism as an idea, a doctrine, a realisation, is universal; it is Italian in its particular institutions, but it is universal in the spirit, nor could it be otherwise. The spirit is universal by reason of its nature". (The Doctrine of Fascism, by Benito Mussolini).

Religious Education and Wardha Scheme

While the Wardha Scheme claims to exclude the religious instructions of different Indian Communities, it really aims at supplanting all other religions by a new religion, Gandhism. The Muslims take strongest exception to this and wish to emphasise that the most outstanding fact in the history of Muslim education in India is that the Muslims have all along insisted on the teaching of Islam as one of the most essential ingredients of the education of a Muslim boy. Even the Government of India had to concede to this demand and a number of schemes for separate Muslim institutions have already got the support of certain provincial Governments.

Reverting to the syllabus of the Wardha Scheme, one finds in it an attempt to inculcate in the mind of the student the idea that "all religions meet in their essentials in perfect harmony". This is obviously an incorrect and misleading point of view. There are many essentials of Islam which are exclusively Islamic and which cannot be harmonised with the teaching of other religions.

The Basic Schools

The Basic Schools are already being started under the Wardha Scheme. The scheme aims at creating an atmosphere in which all social subjects, specially civics will be taught. A glance at the distribution of teaching work in the school shows that more than two-thirds of the time will be devoted to parctical work. Apart from this, the practical training in civics also covers a large part of the child's time outside the school. In short in Mr Gandhi's own words, the schools are to teach more than the books and teachers. The schools, therefore, require more serious attention and can inflict much greater harm than the entire syllabus.

In the present practical training in civics the main stress

has been laid on territorial allegiance. In the early stages village is presented as the only source of inspiration and the whole concern of the child. Later on comes the town and finally India claims the child's entire allegiance. The scheme specifically subordinates religion to the "love of mother-land, reverence for its past and a belief in its future destiny".

Besides this, the celebration of seasonal Hindu holidays, music and dances occupy an important place in this training. These being in conflict with Islamic life are bound to lead to trouble. The suggestion in the syllabus that the Muslims suffer from social disabilities like the Harijans, is calculated to create an inferiority complex in them.

Syllabus

This syllabus can be discussed adequately by dividing it into three parts, viz.—(1) the syllabus of Grade I, which intends to introduce the child to his immediate environment as to the remotest; (2) the syllabus of Grades II to VI, which specially provides for the teaching of history. It aims at leading the child to the realisation of his heritage to enable him to build up his future; (3) Finally, the syllabus for Grade VII which ushers the child into the world of today. The object of this part of the syllabus is to introduce the child to the various movements and forces at work in India and other countries, and to enlist his sympathies and enthusiasm for such of them as are, according to the notions of the framers of the Wardha Scheme, forces for the good.

Taking the syllabus for social studies along with that of language for Grade I, we find that its treatment is purely materialistic. The stories of the primitive man in social studies and the fables and stories included in the syllabus of languages all invariably lead to the same conclusion and are completely devoid of any suggestion that the evolution of human society has a spiritual background.

In the second part of the syllabus, which deals with History, the first three years are devoted to the teaching of Hindu history, along with fragments of the history of ancient races, e.g. Romans, Greeks, Hebrew, Persians, Chinese, etc. After four years' study of the history of other peoples, the Muslim child is introduced to portions of Islamic history and this will be taught for one year only, namely, in Grade V. The syllabus of Muslim history can be divided into two parts namely that which deals with the history of Islam in India and that which is concerned with the history of Islam outside India.

The whole syllabus of Muslim history, in letter and spirit, undermines the real nature of it. It ignores the fact that—(1) Islam has all along been a world-wide movement; (2) it brought about a revolution in the social, cultural, and political concepts of mankind; and (3) for over one thousand years it remained the dominant force in the world and carried everything before it.

The third part of the syllabus for social studies is devoted to the current problems of India and of the world the main topics of which are stated below:

1. *Indian National Movement.* It deals with the history of the Indian National Congress and is intended to enlist the support of the coming generations of Muslims for the Congress by exploiting the receptive mind of young Muslim children. It also belittles the ideals and ignores the achievements of Muslim leaders.

2. *Socialism.* The teaching of Socialism as a world force against the tyrannies of capitalism and imperialism is a propagandistic move. In spite of its being an avowedly atheistic creed, with a background of anti-religious campaigns, it is being presented as the liberator of humanity. It leaves out of consideration the study of Islamic socialism.

Muslim Education

Under the present system while there are some denominational institutions; in all Government institutions the Hindu, Muslim and Christian children are educated together. As long as impartiality is observed in the educational system truly secular common institutions serve a useful purpose. However, in case the system of education is based on the political creed of a party, in order to produce citizens of a corporate according to the notions of the Congress, which is predominantly a Hindu body the Muslims in this case from instinctive reaction will have to demand a separate educational system for their own nationals. It is contrary to the true educational spirit to give education provided by the state a religious setting which does not command general allegiance. Those who want to impose a particular culture and propagate a special political creed are really responsible for this tendency.

Finance

It is also worth mentioning that there are a number of *auquaf* (endowments) which are specially dedicated for the education and national welfare of Muslims. It is high time that all such scattered resources should be brought together for the building up of the nation's future.

The following suggestions are offered below:

1. A committee of members of legislature be formed to secure from the various governments the due share of funds for Muslim education.

2. The Muslim Waqfs may be another possible source of Income.

3. Public opinion must be created amongst the Muslims to help their institutions, local or central.

An educational fund should be raised in every province.

The Muslims, therefore, in India or in any other country form a nationality of their own, with their own view point on all aspects of life, and can own no allegiance to soil blood or colour.

An educational scheme, therefore, to safeguard language, religion and culture should be calculated to impart to the coming generations of the Indian Mussalmans a true conception of Islam and its spirit, and to prepare them for the part they ought to play in strengthening their national solidarity in India and in achieving its independence from foreign domination.

It must also equip them with the knowledge of science and of other useful subjects in order to increase their capacity for thought and action and should create in them a widespread and living interest for technical and applied education by (*a*) appealing to the well-to-do people; (*b*) appeals to the public in general for contributions; for example a pice per rupee from the income of every earning Muslim.

Control, Guidance and Supervision

The Congress Governments are introducing a scheme of education based on their conceptions and want to bring about a change in the mode of life of the people. It is only natural for a minority to demand the control of the education of its own nationals.

The control of the education of a people, placed in circumstances as the Indians Muslims are, should be essentially and exclusively in their own hands. It is an inevetable corollary to their being politically and socially a distinct entity.

In the present times, when there is a great political and social upheaval in India and innumerable conflicting ideologies are being propagated everywhere the younger generation of Muslims in India needs special protection against any destructive intervention in their healthy intellectual and social growth along Islamic lines. Moreover, it should be clearly understood

that Muslim education should be designed and guided in view of the needs of the Muslim nation in India as a whole, though it exists in majority in some parts of India and is placed in the position of a minority in others. The task before the Muslim nation is to see the healthy growth of the national ideals amongst the Muslims inhabiting the different parts of this vast subcontinent. It is, therefore, necessary that:

1. The Muslims must have complete control over their education as regards—(*a*) policy; (*b*) finance; (*c*) curriculum; (*d*) institutions; and (*e*) supervision.

2. An organisation, which would guide the destiny of Muslims in India, must take the entire charge of Muslim education.

3. Muslim education, language and culture being All-India problems, should be tackled in co-ordination by the centre and the provinces.

In the light of the above principles the following practical suggestions are made:

1. The Muslim Organisations must institute a permanent Central Education Advisory Board to assist it.

2. In all provinces and in the central legislature one or more Muslim members should be charged with the responsibility of Muslim education.

3. There should be a Muslim Education Board in every province for (*a*) protecting Muslim institutions from destructive internal and external influences ; (*b*) supervising the working of the Muslim Institutions; and (*c*) guiding Muslim Education along the desired lines.

4. The Central and Provincial Educational Boards must be given authority in the matter of finance and supervision to such an extent as might be compatible with the successful running of the whole system.

5. The Muslim Institutions must be inspected by Muslim Staff specially engaged for the purpose. The educational and cultural activities of Congress Governments should be watched carefully.

74

Resolution passed at the Meeting of the Working Committe of the All-India Muslim League, Meerut, 26 March, 1939

Whereas the All-India Muslim League is opposed to the Scheme of Federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 and whereas the working of the provincial part of the Constitution has created grave apprehensions amongst Muslims and other minorities regarding their future, because the Provincial scheme has utterly failed to safeguard even the elementary rights of the Muslim minorities in various provinces, and whereas by a resolution passed at the Patna Session in December 1938 the President of the All-India Muslim League was authorised to adopt such course as may be necessary with a view to explore the possibility of a suitable alternative which will safeguard the interests of the Mussalmans and other minorities, the President with the concurrence of the Working Committee hereby appoints a committee of the following gentlemen to examine various schemes already propounded by those who are fully versed in the Constitutional developments of India and other countries and those that may be submitted hereafter to the President and report to the Working Committee their conclusions at an early date:

1. Mr M.A. Jinnah (President);
2. The Hon. Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan;
3. Nawab Mohammad Ismail Khan Saheb;
4. Syed Abdul Aziz Saheb;
5. Sir Abdoola Haroon;
6. The Hon. Sir Kh. Nazimuddin;
7. Abdul Matin Choudhri Saheb;
8. Sardar Aurangzeb Khan Saheb;
9. Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan Saheb (Convener).

75

Resolution on the Wardha Scheme passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 3 July, 1939

Apart from its origin, conception and communal aspect, there are fundamental objections to the Wardha Scheme of Basic Education, and the Working Committee disapproves the

Wardha Scheme and the text books which have been prepared in this connection on the following grounds, among others:

(1) The Scheme is calculated to destroy Muslim culture gradually but surely and to secure the domination of Hindu culture.

(2) It imposes the Congress ideology and aims at inculcating, among others, the doctrine of ahinsa.

(3) Its objective is to infuse the political creed, policy and programme of one party, namely the Congress, into the minds of the children.

(4) It has neglected the question of providing facilities for religious instruction.

(5) Under the guise of the name Hindustani the scheme is meant to spread what is highly Sanskritised Hindi and to suppress Urdu which is really the lingua franca of India at present.

(6) The text books prescribed, and provisionally sanctioned by some Provincial Governments, are highly objectionable from the Muslim point of view in that they are not only offensive to the feelings and sentiments of the Muslims, but they are mainly devoted to the praises of Hindu religion, philosophy and heroes, and minimise the Islamic contribution to the world, and India in particular, ignore Muslim culture, history and heroes, and speak of them with scant courtesy.

76

Resolutions passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 28 August, 1939

1. (*a*) Resolved that this Council, while deploring the policy of the British Government towards the Muslims of India by attempting to force upon them against their will a constitution and in particular Federal Scheme as embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935 which allows a permanent hostile communal majority to trample upon their religious, political, social and economic rights and the utter neglect and indifference shown by the Viceroy and the Governors in the Congress governed provinces in exercising their special powers to protect and secure justice to the minorities and towards the Arabs in Palestine in refusing to meet their demands, holds the view that in these circumstances if the British Government desires to enlist the support and the sympathy of the Muslims of the world and particularly of the Indian Muslims in future contingencies it must meet the demands of the Muslims of India without delay.

(*b*) The Council considers it premature at present to determine the attitude of the Muslims in the event of a World War breaking out.

(*c*) The Council meanwhile directs the Muslim League, if necessary, to get in touch with the Islamic countries and ascertain their views.

(*d*) In case any sudden contingency arises the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League shall have the power to decide this issue.

2. Resolved that the opinions and sentiments expressed by the Hon'ble Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan in his statement to the press on the 25th of August, 1939 in no way represent the views of the Mussalmans of India.

3. This meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League strongly condemns the policy of the British Government that in spite of continuous and repeated demands of the of the Muslim League it has, in consideration of its Military requirements, so far deprived the people of Baluchistan of their political rights whch have already been granted to the rest of the provinces in British India.

The Council further deplores the fact that the people of Baluchistan are also being denied all those facilities for their educational advancement which are enjoyed by the rest of India.

This meeting strongly demands that the Province of Baluchistan should be granted Prorvincial Autonomy and also that a first rate college be established in the said Province for purposes of educational advancement.

77

Resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 18 September, 1939

1. The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League appreciate the course adopted by H.E. the Viceroy in inviting Mr M.A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, and apprising him regarding the international situation resulting in war, and his own views, to be conveyed to the Muslim League. The Working Committee have given their most earnest consideration to H.E. the Viceroy's views conveyed to them by the President and also to the pronouncement made by the Viceroy since the declaration of war by Great Britain as also His Excel-

lency's address to the Members of the Central Legislature on the 11th of September, 1939.

2. The Committee are of opinion that the views expressed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League by its resolution No. 8 of the 27th of August, 1939 in the following words "while deploring the policy of the British Government towards the Muslims of India by attempting to force upon them against their will a constitution, and in particular the Federal Scheme as embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, which allows a permanent hostile communal majority to trample upon their religious, political, social and economic rights and the utter neglect and indifference shown by the Viceroy and the Governors in the Congress-governed provinces in exercising their special powers to protect and secure justice to the minorities; and towards the Arabs in Palestine in refusing to meet their demands, holds the view that in these circumstances if the British Government desires to enlist the support and the sympathy of the Muslims of the world, and particularly of the Indian Muslims in future contingencies it must meet the demands of the Muslims of India without delay," are the true sentiments and opinions of the Muslims of India.

3. The Working Committee appreciate the declaration of H.E. the Viceroy, which is in the interest of India and parti cularly the Mussalmans, that the Federal Scheme embodie d in the Government of India Act, 1935 has been suspended. They wish that instead of its being suspended it had been abandoned completely and desire to convey to His Majesty's Government that they should do so without further delay. The Committee desire to make it clear that they do not endorse the "Federal objective" of His Majesty's Government referred to by His Excellency in his address to the Members of the Central Legislature and strongly urge upon the British Government to review and revise the entire problem of India's future constitution *de novo* in the light of the experience gained by the working of the present provincial constitution of India and developments that have taken place since 1935 or may take place hereafter.

4. The Committee in this connection wish to point out that Muslim India occupies a special and peculiar position in the polity of India and for several decades it had hoped to occupy an honourable place in the national life, government and administration of the country and worked for free India with Free and Independent Islam in which they could play an equal part with the major community with complete sense of security for their religious, political, cultural, social, and

economic rights and interests; but the developments that have taken place, and especially since the inauguration of the provincial Constitution based on the so-called democratic parliamentary system of government, and the recent experiences of over two years have established beyond doubt that it has resulted wholly in a permanent communal majority and the domination of the Hindus over the Muslim minorities whose life and liberty, property and honour, are in danger and even their religious rights and culture are being assailed and annihilated evary day under the Congress Governments in various provinces.

5. That while Muslim India stands against exploitation of the people of India and has repeatedly declared in favour of "Free India" it is equally opposed to the domination of Hindu majority over Mussalmans and other minorities and vassalization of Muslim India and is irrevocably opposed to any "federal objective" which must necessarily result in a majority community rule under the guise of democracy and parliamentary system of government. Such a constitution is totally unsuited to the genius of the peoples of the country which is composed of various nationalities and does not constitute a national state.

6. The Muslim League condemns unprovoked aggression and the doctrine that "might is right" and upholds the principles of freedom of humanity and "that the will of the strongest irrespective of right and justice cannot be allowed to prevail". The Committee express their deep sympathy for Poland, England and France. The Committee however feel that real and solid Muslim cooperation and support to Great Britain in this hour of trial cannot be secured successfully if His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy are unable to secure to the Mussalmans justice and fairplay in the Congress-governed provinces where today their liberty, person, property and honour are in danger and even their elementary rights are most callously trampled upon. The Committee strongly urge upon His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy and Governor-General to direct the Governors to exercise their special powers, where any Provincial Ministry fails to secure justice and fairplay to the Mussalmans or where they resort to oppression or interference with their political, economic, social and cultural rights, in accordance with the sacred promises, assurances and declarations repeatedly made by Great Britain in consequence of which these special powers were expressly embodied in the Statute. The Committee regret to say that so far these special powers have remained dormant and obsolete and the Governors have failed to protect the rights of the Mussalmans under the threat

by the "High Command" of the Congress that exercise of these special powers on the part of the Governors will lead to crises in all the Congress governed provinces, where they are in a solid majority.

7. While the Muslim League stands for the freedom of India the Committee further urge upon His Majesty's Government and ask for an assurance that no declaration regarding the question of constitutional advance for India should be made without the consent and approval of the All-India Muslim League nor any constitution be framed and finally adopted by His Majesty's Government and the British Parliament without such consent and approval.

8. The policy of the British Government towards the Arabs in Palestine has wounded deeply Muslim feeling and sentiment and all representations in that behalf have had no real effect so far. The Committee once more urge upon His Majesty's Government to satisfy the Arab National demands.

9. In full, effective and honourable cooperation of the Mussalmans is desired by the British Government in the grave crisis which is facing the world today and if it is desired to bring it to a successful termination it must create a sense of security and satisfaction amongst the Mussalmans and take into its confidence the Muslim League which is the only organisation that can speak on behalf of Muslim India.

10. At this critical and difficult juncture the committee appeal to every Mussalman to stand solidly under the Flag of the All-India Muslim League with a solemn and sacred determination to make every sacrifice for on it depend the future destiny and the honour of the 90 millions of Mussalmans in India.

78

Extracts from the Viceroy's Declaration of October 18, 1939

His Majesty's Government recognise that when the time comes to resume consideration of the plan for the future Federal Government of India, and of the plan destined to give effect to the assurances given in Parliament by the late Secretary of State, it will be necessary to reconsider in the light of the then circumstances to what extent the details of the plan embodied in the Act of 1935 remain appropriate. And I am authorised now by His Majesty's Government to say that at the end of the war they will be very willing to enter into consultation with

representatives of the several communities, parties and interests in India, and with the Indian Princes, with a view to securing their aid and cooperation in the framing of such modifications as may seem desirable.

I have, I trust, in what I have just said, made clear that the intention and anxiety of His Majesty's Government is, as stated in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor-General, to further the partnership between India and the United Kingdom within the Empire to the end that India may attain her due place among the great Dominions.

The scheme of government embodied in the Act of 1935 was designed as an essential stage in that process. But I have made clear in what I have just said that His Majesty's Government will, at the end of the war, be prepared to regard the scheme of the Act as open to modification in the light of Indian views. And I would make it clear, too, that it will be their object, as at all times in the past it has been, to spare no pains to further agreement by any means in their power in the hope of contributing to the ordered and harmonious progress of India towards her goal.

I remarked finally, speaking of the demands of the minorities for an assurance that full weight would be given to their views and interests. It is unthinkable that we should now proceed to plan afresh, or to modify in any respect any important part of India's future constitution without again taking counsel with those who have in the recent past been so closely associated in a like task with His Majesty's Government and with Parliament.

79

Resolutiou passed at an Emergency Meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 22 October, 1939

After careful examination of the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy dated the 17th October, 1939, the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League appreciate that His Majesty's Government have emphatically repudiated the unfounded claim of the Congress that they alone represent all India, and note with satisfaction that His Majesty's Government recognise the fact that the All-India Muslim League alone truly represents the Mussalmans of India and can speak on their behalf; also, that the rights and interests of the minorities and other important interests concerned have been duly recognised,

The Committee, however, feel constrained to state that the points of vital importance raised by the Muslim League in their statement dated September 18, 1939, are not precisely and categorically met. The Committee, therefore, venture to suggest that in order to secure cooperation on equal footing, as desired by His Excellency further clarification and discussion of those matters that are left in doubt and have not been met satisfactorily are necessary, with a view to arrive at a complete understanding, which alone would enable the Muslim League to cooperate in the matter which concernes not only the Mussalmans of India, but the country at large.

The Committee cannot wholly accept the narration of facts culminating in the enactment of the Government of India Act, 1935, as given in the statement of His Excellency, but do not think it is necessary to enter into a controversy regarding those inaccuracies, historic and otherwise. The opposition of the Muslim League is not merely to the "details" of the plans embodied in the Act of 1935 and the reconsideration thereof, but their demand is that the entire problem of India's future constitution should be wholly examined and revised *de novo*. The Committee reiterate emphatically that no future plan of India's Constitution will be acceptable to the Muslim League unless it meets with their full approval.

The Committee also considered the proposal of His Excellency the Viceroy for the establishment of a "Consultative group", but cannot at present express any opinion with regard to it until its status, constitution, powers, scope and function are fully known but welcome further consultation regarding this matter as proposed by His Excellency in his statement.

In view of the urgency of the matter the Committee hereby authorise the President to take such steps as he may consider proper to have the doubts removed and secure complete clarification of His Excellency's statement and if the President is fully satisfied the Committee empower him to give assurance of cooperation and support on behalf of the Mussalmans of India to the British Government for the purpose of prosecution of the war.

80

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy to Mr Gandhi and the Presidents of the Congress and the Muslim League, November 2, 1939

1. You will remember that I agreed during our conversation yesterday to let you have in concrete form the proposition which

I put to you and the other gentlemen who were present at the meeting, emphasising that I did so with a genuine desire to help, a desire fully shared by His Majesty's Government.

2. The proposition which I invited you and the other gentlemen present to consider, as leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League, was that, given the great importance of ensuring harmonious working at the Centre, you should enter upon discussions between yourselves with a view to discovering whether you could reach a basis of agreement between yourselves in the provincial field, consequent on which you could let me have proposals which would result in representatives of your two organisations immediately participating in the Central Government as members of my Executive Council.

I brought out, too, that, in my judgment, it ought not to be necessary absolutely to resolve every detail of such differences as may exist in the provinces. What was required, as was remarked in the course of the discussion, was a degree of agreement in respect of the provinces, such as to make it possible for my visitors, and the organisations which they represented, to put forward a scheme which could be considered for the Centre.

3. I added, in regard to any arrangement at the Centre:

Firstly, that one would hope that it might be found practicable to include also one or possibly more representatives of other important groups, and that that was a question on which I should value your advice when we came to grapple with the details;

Secondly, that the arrangement which I invited you to consider for the Centre would be an *ad hoc* arrangement for the period of the war, and quite distinct from the much wider question of constitutional reform at the end of the war; and I mentioned that on that last point my declaration had set out the position of His Majesty's Government. I attach a copy of the extracts from that declaration which I brought to the notice of the meeting yesterday;

Thirdly, that the position of anyone appointed to my Executive Council as a member of a political party would be identical, in privileges and in obligations, with that of the existing members of my Council; and

Fourthly, that the arrangement would be within the general scheme of the existing law. It would be admittedly and inevitably a makeshift arrangement for the duration of the campaign. I brought out that what was required now, if we could get a workable scheme together, was to put it into operation with as

little delay as possible, pending the more general review of the whole constitutional position which His Majesty's Government have expressed their readiness to undertake after the conclusion of hostilities.

4. I think the above makes the position clear. Let me, in conclusion, repeat that, as I said yesterday, I am at any time at your disposal or that of the other gentlemen who attended our meeting, whether jointly or singly, to give any assistance in my power in reaching conclusions on these most important matters. I feel certain, as I said yesterday, that the suggestion I have put to you, reflecting as they do very real and substantial evidence of the anxiety of His Majesty's Government to reach a complete understanding, will receive full and sympathetic consideration from you.

81

Reply from the Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy's Letter, November 4, 1939

With reference to the joint interview which Mr Gandhi, Dr Rajendra Prasad, President of the Congress, and myself had with you on November 1 and in reply to your letter dated November 2, I beg to inform you that I understood that the Congress leaders and myself were to consider the proposals of Your Excellency, namely—to quote from Your Excellency's letter:

"The position which I invited you and the other gentlemen present to consider, as leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League, was that, given the great importance of ensuring harmonious working at the Centre, you should enter upon discussion between yourselves in the provincial field, consequent on which you could let me have proposals which would result in representatives of your two organisations immediately participating in the Central Government as members of my Executive Council. I brought out, too, that in my judgment it ought not to be necessary absolutely to resolve every detail of such differences as may exist in the provinces. What was required, as was remarked in the course of the discussion, was a degree of agreement in respect of the provinces such as to make it possible for my visitors, and the organisations which they represented, to put forward a scheme which could be considered for the Centre, without prejudice to the resolution of the Muslim League of October 22, stating that the declaration of Your Excellency, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, was not satisfactory and required further clarification and assurances,

and also without prejudice to the demand of the Congress for a declaration as adumbrated in the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee on October 10."

In consequence I met the leaders of the Congress and I was informed by them finally that they had come to the conclusion that they could not discuss any questions with regard to matters referred to in your letter of the 2nd. instant, relating to the provincial field and at the Centre until the British Government had complied with their demand as embodied in the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee, hence these two questions were not further discussed.

82

Quaid-i-Azam's Rejoinder to Mr Gandhi's Statement on Constituent Assembly, 14 December, 1939

I would have preferred to remain silent, but I am compelled to contradict the vigorous one-sided propaganda of the Congress, both in India and abroad, and, in fact, it is only to defend the Muslim League that I speak at all.

It was not very long ago that Mr Gandhi gave an interview to an American journalist, when he said, in reply to a question, as to what his view was towards the parties in a democratic India, that there was only one party which could deliver the goods, and that was the Congress. Told that there was the Muslim League, Mr Gandhi said: "I would not accept any other party except the Congress". Then it was pointed out to him that if there was to be only one party in India the government would be Fascist and not democratic. Mr Gandhi replied: "Damn it by whatever name you may, there can be only one party in India, and that is the Congress."

Suddenly Mr Gandhi who was always sceptical about the Constituent Assembly, has now become an enthusiastic convert and its champion. He has been misrepresenting and insinuating motives to the Muslim League recently—for instance, that the League is an obstacle to the progress of the country and is out to sell itself to the highest bidder-in his periodical articles published in the Harijan. He generally indulges in a campaign of polemics and metaphysics, ahinsa and truth.

But his interview to the News Chronicle is for the consumption of the British public. A more disingenuous statement it would be difficult to find, coming from Mr Gandhi, and it is a pity it comes from one who is a votary of truth. His sudden

affection for the Constituent Assembly is on a par with what he has only striven for two decades.

"The opinion that counts is Indian opinion, not even the Congress opinion. India's opinion can be ascertained by the free vote of her people. The only true and democratic method is to ascertain their will through abult suffrage, or any agreed equivalent."

The first question will be when he says "any agreed equivalent to adult suffrage", between whom is that agreement to be arrived at? Secondly, if Britain is not to depend on Muslims, Hindus or any other opinion, not even Congress opinion, then what is India's opinion?

Now that the Congress stands exposed, that it does not represent India and that it is really a Hindu body, Mr Gandhi is pleased suddenly to stand for a Constituent Assembly, which, in the present condition of India, will mean a second and larger edition of the Congress.

Having brushed aside the Indian Princes, ignoring their existence altogether, he (Mr Gandhi) proceeds to lay down a most extraordinary proposition. "I fail to see", he says, "Why Britain's intention about India should be dependent upon Muslim, Hindu or any other opinion."

Mr Gandhi then proceeds to say: "So far as the Congress is concerned, the people of the Indian states should be represented precisely on the same footing as those of British India". Who will arrange that? And how are electorates to be established there? And what is to happen to the Treaty rights and relationship between the Biitish Government and the Indian Princes?

Then he proceeds, "Muslims and other accepted minorities may be represented by separate electorates, if necessary". This is a concession, but there is no grace in it when he further proceeds to state that it should be done in the exact proportion to their numbers. He knows perfectly well that they will be in a hopeless minority in the Constituent Assembly of Mr Gandhi's conception, where he hopes to get a brute majority against the Muslims, including other minorities.

He makes a further concession that "they will determine what is required for their protection". Is the Constituent Assembly to be bound by the minority vote as to what is required for their protection and for each minority? And then comes the omnibus clause, which is fundamentally wrong, and once more shows blind arrogance, when he says that in all matters of

common interest the composite majority decision should prevail. Therefore, the Muslims and other minorities will have to submit to the verdict of the Assembly as to the nature, character and the form of the future Constitution of India, which will presumably be dictated by Mr Gandhi on behalf of the Congress, as for instance, Muslims and other minorities may prefer a bicameral legislature, whereas the Congress controlled majority of the Assembly may decide against it—which, according to Mr Gandhi, will be final.

But evidently his new born faith in the Constituent Assembly is getting shaken a bit already, because he says if a better way that the Constituent Assembly could be found "for knowing the will of the people, so far as I know, the Congress will accept it without hesitation". Mr Gandhi is neither concerned with the size of the country nor the illiteracy of the masses. A truly representative Assembly presupposes that in order faithfully to express the judgment of the people it can only be constituted if you have a fully developed public opinion, an electorate educated and experienced, free from superstition and capable of judging the vital political issues affecting the country, and not as India stands today, composed of states, creeds, superstitions and provincial jealousies quite apart from the main division of British India and the Indian States.

The Assembly proposed by Mr Gandhi would at best, therefore, be a packed body manoeuvred and managed by the Congress caucus. It is surprising when Mr Gandhi complacently says that an election campaign will itself be sufficient education for the purpose of broadly knowing the popular will. But have we not had sufficient evidence, under the present Constitution, though in smaller and more informed electorates? And what about the experience of the Congress (with its four anna franchise) of abuses of power and malpractices which were eloquently condemned by Mr Gandhi himself. It will not be the "popular will", as Mr Gandhi professes, but it will be the will of one community, which is in an overwhelming majority.

But he is anxious, "as a friend of Britain bound by many personal ties, that she should come out victorious not because of superiority in the use of arms but because of her will to be just all along the line", hence his anxiety to advise Britain to follow him to secure success in the war.

Mr Gandhi's notion of justice is to follow what he advises, then alone it can be just. I am constrained to say I wish Mr Gandhi will stop airing views which change from day to day and week to week, and which consistently perpetuate inconsis-

tencies and apply his mind to the only and one question, namely, settling the Hindu-Muslim question as he, of all the Congress leaders, is best fitted to represent the Hindus as such and he can deliver the goods on behalf of the Hindus and bring about complete adjustment between the two major communities and the rest will follow. I need hardly reiterate that I am willing to help to the utmost of my power on behalf of the Muslims towards an honourable solution.

Apart from this academic discussion about a Constituent Assembly, it shows colossal ignorance, both historic and constitutional, to expect a foreign power that is dominating this country to sign its death warrant. The Constituent Assembly can only be real when it has got the sovereign authority of the people behind it, forged by the people, and who are in a position to convene such a supreme national body, whose decisions and verdict could be respected and honoured and whose fiat and writs could be enforced. It is puerile to ask the British Government, in the first instance, to call a Constituent Assembly of another nation and afterwards have the honour and privilege of placing the Constitution framed by this supreme assembly of India on the Statute Book of the British Parliament.

83

Correspondence between the Quaid-i-Azam and Pandit Jawharlal Nehru, December 1939

In releasing the correspondence to the press on 7th January, 1940, the Quaid-i-Azam said:

"I regret to find that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, during his recent tour in the Punjab and elsewhere, has thought fit to attack me in a manner unworthy of any responsible leader. He accuses me of being bent upon the preservation of British domination over India which I can only characterise as not only unwarranted, but mean. The reasons for his refusing to continue his talks with me, as given by him, are far from correct, are misleading and unfair.

"I would not further comment upon his reckless and irresponsible pronouncements, but I shall rest content with releasing the correspondence between us on the subject. This will show the true reasons for his refusing to proceed further in the matter, and I leave it to the public to judge the impossible attitude that is being taken up by him and the Congress."

From Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Quaid-i-Azam

Anand Bhawan,
Allahabad, December 1, 1939.

My dear Jinnah,

When we met last in Delhi, it was agreed that we should meet again to discuss various aspects of the communal problem. You told me that on your return to Bombay you would write to me suggesting some date for such a meeting. I have been looking forward to your letter since then. I hope that whenever it is convenient for you to fix a date you will kindly let me know.

Sir Stafford Cripps is coming to India soon and is likely to spend two or three weeks in this country. He is on his way to China. I do not yet exactly know when he will reach here, but probably he will come in about a week's time. During his brief stay in India he would like to meet you if that is possible. I do not know his programme at all, nor do I know what cities he intends visiting. But I take it that he will go to Bombay. Could kindly let me know if you are likely to be in Bombay about the third week of this month or later? This information might help him to arrange his programme. He is coming by air and will land in Allahabad.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) Jawaharlal Nehru.

From Quaid-i-Azam to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill,
4th December, 1939.

My dear Jawahar,

I am in receipt of your letter of the lst December and thank you for it. As at present advised I hope to be in Bombay for the next two or three weeks, and if it is convenient to you I shall be very glad to see you and fix up any date that may suit you. Please, therefore, let me know what date and time will suit you.

As regards Sir Stafford Cripps, I received a letter from him, and I have already replied to him c/o your address as directed by him, and as I have already stated I shall be here in Bombay and as he is arriving at Allahabad on the 8th, as I understand from his letter, I shall be very glad to see him when

he is in Bomaby. On hearing from him I shall fix up also the date and time that may suit him.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. Jinnah.

From Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Quaid-i-Azam

Anand Bhawan, Allahabad,
December 9, 1939.

My dear Jinnah,

Two days ago I sent you a letter informing you that I intended going to Bombay soon and hoped to meet you there. Yesterday morning I read in the newspapers your statement fixing December 22nd as a day of deliverance and thanksgiving as a mark of relief that the Congress Governments have at last ceased to function. I have read this statement very carefully more than once and have given twenty-four hours thought to the matter. It is not for me, in this letter, to enter into any controversy about facts or impressions or conclusions. You know my views about these; formed, I hope, in all earnestness and with all desire to find the truth. It may be that I am mistaken but I have sought more light and that light has not come.

But what has oppressed me terribly since yesterday is the realisation that our sense of values and objectives in life and politics differs so very greatly. I had hoped, after our conversations, that this was not so great, but now the gulf appears to be wider than ever. Under these circumstances, I wonder what purpose will be served by our discussing with each other the problems that confront us. There must be some common ground for discussion, some common objective aimed at, for that discussion to yield fruit. I think I owe it to you as well as to myself to put this difficulty before you.

You were good enough to show me in Delhi a letter you had received from Bijnor, I enquired into the matters and I am informed that the version of facts given to you is not correct and is wholly misleading. If you would care to have an explanation of what happened, I could obtain it for you from Bijnor. For this purpose, I would like to have a copy of the letter you showed me in Delhi.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) Jawaharlal Nehru.

From Quaid-i-Azam to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill, Bombay,
13th December, 1939.

Dear Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 9th December. I did not know where to address my reply to you as your movements were reported in the press to be uncertain. The latest announcement is that you are arriving in Bombay on the 14th of December, and I am therefore sending this letter to your Bombay address. I quite agree with you that "there must be some common ground for discussion, some common objective aimed at for that discussion to yield fruit"; that is the very reason why I made it clear in our conversation at Delhi in October last to Mr Gandhi and yourself, first, that so long as the Congress is not prepared to treat the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India, it was not possible to carry on talks regarding the Hindu-Muslim settlement as that was the basis laid down by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, and second, that we cannot endorse the Congress demand for the declaration as laid down in the resolution of the Working Committee confirmed by the All-India Congress Committee of 10th October, 1939, apart from the nebulous and impracticable character of it, till we reach an agreement with regard to the minority problem. The Muslim League was also not satisfied with the declaration made by the Viceroy. If happily we could settle the Hindu-Muslim question, then we would be in a position to evolve an agreed formula for a demand of declaration by His Majesty's Government that would satisfy us; neither the first nor the second suggestion of mine was acceptable to Mr Gandhi or to yourself at Delhi, but you were good enough to express your wish that you would like to meet me again and I said that I would be always glad to see you. In reply to your letter of the 1st December expressing your wish to see me in Bombay I informed you that I shall be in Bombay till the 3rd week of December and I shall be glad to see you, and I can only say that if you desire to discuss the matter further I am at your disposal.

As regards your reference to the Bijnor incident, I am sure that you will agree with me that it requires a thorough judicial examination and enquiry before any conclusion can be arrived at, and it is hardly worth our while to deal with one instance, for in my judgment the whole working of the constitution and

our charges against the Congress Government must be thoroughly examined by a Royal Commission.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. Jinnah.

From Jawaharlal Nehru to Quaid-i-Azam

Sakina Mansion,
Carmichael Road, Bombay,
December 14, 1939.

My dear Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of the 13th December which was delivered to me in the forenoon today on my arrival here. I sent you my last letter from Allahabad after reading and giving full though to your statement about the celebration of "a day of delivernance and thanksgiving" by the Muslims. This statement had distressed me greatly as it made me realise that the gulf that separated us in our approach to public problems was very great. In view of this fundamental difference, I wondered what common ground there was and I put my difficulty before you. That difficulty remains.

In your letter you have emphasized two other preliminary conditions before any common ground for discussion can arise. The first is that the Congress must treat the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India. The Congress has always considered the League as a very important and influential organisation of the Muslims and it is because of this that we have been eager to settle any differences that may exist between us. But presumably what you suggest is something more and involves some kind of repudiation by us or dissociation from other Muslims who are not in the League. There are, as you know, a large number of Muslims in the Congress, who have been and are our closest colleagues. There are Muslim organisations like the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, the All-India Shia Conference, the Majlis-e-Ahrar, the All-India Momin Conference, etc. apart from trade unions and peasant unions which have many Muslims as their members. As a general rule, many of these organisations and individuals have adopted the same political platform as we have done in the Congress. We cannot possibly dissociate ourselves from them or disown them in any way.

You have rightly pointed out on many occasions that the Congress does not represent every body in India. Of course not. It does not represent those who disagree with it, whether they

are Muslims or Hindus. In the ultimate analysis it represents its members and sympathisers. So also the Muslim League, as any other organisation, represents its own members and sympathisers. But there is this vital difference that while the Congress constitutionally had its membership open to all who subscribe to its objective and methods, the Muslim League is only open to Muslims. Thus the Congress constitutionally has a national basis and it cannot give that up without putting an end to its existence. There are many Hindus, as you know, in the Hindu Mahasabha who oppose the idea of the Congress representing the Hindus as such. Then there are the Sikhs and others who claim that they should be heard when communal matters are considered.

I am afraid, therefore, that if your desire is that we should consider the League as the sole organisation representing the Muslims to the exclusion of all others, we are wholly unable to accede to it. It would be equally at variance with facts if we made a similar claim for the Congress in spite of the vastness of the Congress organisation. But I would venture to say that such questions do not arise when two organisations deal with each other and consider problems of mutual interest.

Your second point is that the Muslim League cannot endorse the Congress demand for a declaration from the British Government. I regret to learn this for this means that, apart from communal questions, we differ entirely on purely political grounds. The Congress demand is essentially for a declaration of war aims and more especially for a declaration of Indian independence and the right of the Indian people to frame their own constitution without external interference. If the Muslim League does not agree to this, this means that our political objectives are wholly dissimilar. The Congress demand is not new. It is inherent in article one of the Congress and all our policy for many years past has been based on it. It is inconceivable to me how the Congress can give it up or even vary it. Personally I would be entirely opposed to any attempt at variation. But this is not a personal matter. There is a resolution of the All-India Congress Committee, endorsed by a thousand meetings all over India, and I am powerless to ignore it.

It thus seems that politically we have no common ground and that our objectives are different. That in itself makes discussion difficult and fruitless. What led me to write my last letter to you also remains the propect of a celebration of a day of deliverance by the Muslims as suggested by you. That

raises very vital and far-reaching issues, in which I need not go now, but which must influence all of us. That approach to the communal problem cannot be reconciled with an attempt to solve it.

I feel, therefore, that it will serve little purpose for us to meet at this stage and under these conditions with this background. I should like to assure you, however, that we are always prepared to have free and frank discussions of the communal or other problems as between the Congress and the League.

I note what you say about the Bijnor incident. It has been our misfortune that charges are made in a one-sided way and they are never inquired into or disposed of. You will appreciate that it is very easy to make complaints and very unsafe to rely upon them without due inquiry.

Yours sincerely
(Sd.) Jawaharlal Nehru.

From Quaid-i-Azam to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

Mount Pleasant Road,
Malabar Hill, Bombay,
December 15, 1939.

Dear Jawaharlal,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th December, 1939 and I am sorry to say that you have not appreciated my position with regard to the second point. I did not say that Muslim League cannot endorse the Congress demand for a declaration from British Government. What I have said was that we cannot endorse the Congress demand for the declaration as laid down in the resolution of the Working Committee and confirmed by the All-India Congress Committee of the 10th October, 1939 for the reasons I have already specified in my letter.

If this resolution of the Congress cannot be modified in any way, as you say that personally you would be entirely opposed to any attempt at variation of it and as you make it clear that you are wholly unable to treat with the Muslim League as the authoritative and representative organisation of the Mussalmans of India, may I know in these circumstances what do you expect or wish me to do?

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. Jinnah.

From Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Quaid-i-Azam

Bombay,
December 16, 1939.

My dear Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of December 15th. I realise the difference you have pointed out. Of course, the Muslims cannot oppose the idea of any declaration. What the Congress had asked for was an enunciation of war aims and a recognition of India's independence and the right of her people to frame their constitution, a right that must necessarily be inherent in independence. All these are basic principles which flow from our objective of independence, and as the Muslim League has the same declared objective, there should be no difference of opinion about them. In the application of these principles many important matters will no doubt have to be considered. But so far as the basic demands are concerned, they are of the very essence of Indian nationalism. To give them up or to vary them materially is to knock down our case for independence.

In regard to the war also the Congress has repeatedly declared its policy during the last eleven years. The present declaration is a logical outcome of that policy. I have personally had some share in shaping this policy and I have attached importance to it. You will appreciate that it is exceedingly difficult, apart from the question of desirablility, to vary such long-established and fundamental policies. These policies are in their essence and, I would venture to say, are the only policies which flow from a demand for Indian freedom. Details may be considered and discussed, their application should be worked out in mutual cooperation and, in particular, the interests of various groups and minorities should be considered carefully and protected. But to challenge the vary basis of that declaration is to demonstrate that there is a great difference in political outlook and policies. This, as such, has nothing to do with the Hindu-Muslim problem. It is because of this that I feel that there is little in common in our political objectives.

May I say again that no one on our behalf, so far as I know, challenges or minimises the authority, influence and importance of the Muslim League? It is for this reason that we have been eager to discuss matters with it and to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problems that confront us. Unfortunately we never seem to reach even the proper discussion of these problems as various hurdles and obstructions, in the shape of conditions

precedent, come in our way. These conditions precedent, as I have ventured to point out to you, have far-reaching significance. I do not know why they should be allowed to obstruct all progress or prevent us from considering these problems. It should not be difficult to remove these hurdles and come to grips with the subject itself. But as these hurdles continue and others are added to them, I am compelled to think that the real difficulty is the difference in political outlook and objectives.

At the present moment, the decision to have an all-India demonstration on December 22nd has added a psychological barrier which effectively prevents mutual approach and discussion. I regret this exceedingly and have earnestly wished that you would see your way to remove this barrier which is leading and can only lead to ill-will. I still hope that you may be able to do so.

I do wish to assure you that for my part I do not want to leave any stone unturned which can lead to mutual understanding and settlement. But you will not have me, as I do not want to have you, leave integrity of mind and purpose in pursuit of anything. Nothing worthwhile can be gained that way. I have deep political convictions and I have laboured in accordance with them these many years. I cannot leave them at any time, much less now when the world is in the throes of a terrific crisis.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) Jawaharlal Nehru.

84

Correspondence between the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow and the Quaid-i-Azam, November-December 1939

From M.A. Jinnah, Esq., M.L.A., President, All-India Muslim League

New Delhi,
November 5th, 1939.

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I wish to thank you for giving me the interview on the 4th of November as you had promised in your letter of the 28th of October wherein you stated that you will be glad at some suitable moment to endeavour further to elucidate any points that there may be in doubt as desired by the resolution of the Working

Committee of the All-India Muslim League of the 22nd of October.

In my interview with you on the 4th of November the subject was fully discussed and now, as desired by Your Excellency, I am herewith submitting to you the following points for your consideration and early reply:

(1) that so soon as circumstances may permit or immediately after the war the entire problem of India's future constitution, apart from the Government of India Act, 1935, shall be examined and reconsidered *de novo*;

(2) that no declaration shall, either in principle or otherwise be made or any constitution be enacted by His Majesty's Government or the Parliament without the approval and consent of the two major communities of India, viz. the Mussalmans and the Hindus;

(3) that His Majesty's Government should try and meet all reasonable national demands of the Arabs in Palestine;

(4) that the Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim power or country.

I have already, in my interview, fully explained the reasons and the grounds in support of these points over and above what is indicated in the statement of the 18th of September and the resolution of the 22nd of October of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League copies of which have already been sent to Your Excellency.

There is one more point which was mentioned in the statement of the Working Committee of the 18th of September, viz., the question of securing justice and fairplay to the Mussalmans in the Congress-governed provinces where even their elementary rights were being ruthlessly trampled upon; but as the Congress Ministries have gone out of office I do not desire to say anything regarding this matter at present.

May I infrom Your Excellency that I am leaving for Bombay tomorrow morning?

Yours sincerely,

M.A. Jinnah.

To M.A. Jinnah, Esq., M.L.A., President, All-India Muslim League

The Viceroy's House,
New Delhi,
November 7th, 1939.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

Many thanks for your letter of 5th November. I fully appreciate the importance of the points which you raise and I will not fail to let you have as early a reply as practicable.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

From M.A. Jinnah, Esq., M.L.A., President, All-India Muslim League

Bombay,
November 18th, 1939.

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

Thank you for your letter of the 7th November, 1939. Since the receipt of your letter I have been pressed with inquiries from different parts of the country as to how and where we stand. Would you, therefore, mind if I were to publish my letter to Your Excellency, dated the 5th November and your letter under reply.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

To M.A. Jinnah, Esq., M.L.A., President, All-India Muslim League

Viceroy's Camp,
November 26th/27th, 1939.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of the 18th November. I quite understand your anxiety to publish your letter to me of the 5th November and my acknowledgement of it. I should welcome it if you could postpone publication for, say, another ten days, as I am anxious that the interval between publication by you and my reply (which naturally must take some little time to prepare as I have to consult His Majesty's Government) should be as short as possible. But if you feel that it is essential for you to

publish without waiting so long, I can raise no objection, though I would ask you to be kind enough to let me know in advance the date you contemplate.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

Telegram

From... Mr Jinnah, Bombay.

To.... Lord Linlithgow, New Delhi.

29th November, 1939,

Hope my letter eighteenth has reached your Excellency am waiting for reply as soon as possible.

Telegram

M.A. Jinnah, Esq.,
Little Gibbs Road, Malabar Hill,
Bombay, 29th November, 1939.

Many thanks for your telegram of today. I hope you will by now have received my letter of 27th November posted from Bahawalpur.

Viceroy

To M.A. Jinnah, Esq., M.L.A., President, All-India Muslim League

Viceroy's Camp, India,
Calcutta, December 23rd, 1939.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

I am now in a position to reply to your letter of November 5th, in which you submitted certain points for my consideration. You will, I am sure, appreciate that more than one of your questions, if considered in the light of all the implications involved in it, would raise issues affecting other communities in India, and that this correspondence between us would not be an appropriate medium for making pronouncements on them. But I hope that my answers, limited though their scope may be by this consideration, will nonetheless serve to remove your difficulties.

2. My answer to your first question is that the declaration I made with the approval of His Majesty's Government on

October 18th last does not exclude examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based.

3. With reference to your second point, I can assure you that His Majesty's Government are not under any misapprehension as to the importance of the contentment of the Muslim community to the stability and success of any constitutional developments in India. You need, therefore, have no fear that the weight which your community's position in India necessarily gives their views will be underrated.

4. In framing their policy for Palestine, His Majesty's Government have endeavoured to meet all reasonable Arab demands, and they continue to be fully alive to the importance of that issue.

5. Finally, you asked for an assurance that Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim power or country. This question is fortunately hypothetical, since His Majesty is not at war with any Muslim power. You will appreciate, however, that it is impossible to give a guarantee in terms so wide as those of your letter, which would have the effect of limiting India's right to use its own army in its own defence in circumstances which cannot now be foreseen; in the present situation, however, as you are aware, every precaution has been taken by His Majesty's Government at the instance of the Government of India to ensure that Muslim feeling in India on this matter is fully respected.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

85

Extracts from Quaid-i-Azam's Presidential Address at the Twenty-seventh Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Lahore, 22-24 March, 1940

. . . . Before the war was declared the greatest danger to the Muslims of India was the possible inauguration of the federal scheme in the central Government. We know what machinations were going on. But the Muslim League was stoutly resisting them in every direction. We felt that we could never accept the dangerous scheme of the central federal Government embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935. I am sure that we have made no small contribution towards persuading the British

Government to abandon the scheme of Central Federal Government. In creating that mind in the British Government the Muslim League, I have, no doubt, played no small part. You know that the British people are very obdurate people. They are also very conservative; and although they are very clever they are slow in understanding. After the war was declared the Viceroy naturally wanted help from the Muslim League. It was only then that he realised that the Muslim League was a power. For it will be remembered that up to the time of the declaration of war, the Viceroy never thought of me but of Gandhi and Gandhi alone. I have been the leader of an important party in the Legislature for a considerable time, larger than the one I have the honour to lead at present, the present Muslim League Party in the Central Legislature. Yet, the Viceroy never thought of me. Therefore, when I got this invitation from the Viceroy along with Mr Gandhi, I wondered within myself why I was so suddenly promoted and then I concluded that the answer was the 'All-India Muslim League' whose President I happen to be. I believe that was the worst shock that the Congress High Command received because it challenged their sole authority to speak on behalf of India. And it is quite clear from the attitude of Mr Gandhi and the High Command that they have not yet recovered from that shock. My point is that, I want you to realise the value, the importance, the significance of organising ourselves. I will not say anything more on the subject.

Now, coming to the period after the declaration of war, our position was that we were between the devil and the deep sea. But I do not think that the devil or the deep sea is going to get away with it. Anyhow our position is this. We stand unequivocally for the freedom of India. But it must be freedom of all India and not freedom of one section or, worse still, of the Congress caucus and slavery of Mussalmans and other minorities.

Situated in India as we are, we naturally have our past experiences and particularly the experiences of the past $2\frac{1}{2}$ years of provincial constitution in the Congress-governed provinces. We have learnt many lessons. We are now, therefore, very apprehensive and can trust nobody. I think it is a wise rule for every one not to trust anybody too much. Sometimes we are led to trust people but when we find in actual experience that our trust has been betrayed, surely that ought to be sufficient lesson for any man not to continue his trust in those who have betrayed us. Ladies and gentlemen, we never thought that the Congress High Command would have acted in the manner in which they

actually did in the Congress governed provinces. I never dreamt that they would ever come down so low as that. I never could believe that there would be a gentleman's agreement between the Congress and the Government to such an extent that although we cried hoarse, week and in week out, the Governors were supine and the Governor-General was helpless. We reminded them of their special responsibilities to us and to other minorities and the solemn pledges they had given to us. But all that had become a dead letter. Fortunately, Providence came to our help and that gentleman's agreement war broken to pieces and the Congress, thank Heavens, went out of office. I think they are regretting their resignations very much. Their bluff was called off. So far so good. I therefore, appeal to you, in all seriousness that I can command, to organise yourselves in such a way that you may depend upon none except your own inherent strength. That is your only safeguard and the best safeguard.....

Now, what is our position with regard to future constitution? It is that as soon as circumstances permit or immediately after the war at the latest the whole problem of India's future constitution must be examined *de novo* and the Act of 1935 must go once for all. We do not believe in asking the British Government to make declarations. These declarations are really of no use. You cannot possibly succeed in getting the British Government out of this country by asking them to make declarations. However, the Congress asked the Viceroy to make a declaration. The Viceroy said, "I have made the declaration'. The Congress said, 'No, no, we want another kind of declaration. You must declare now and at once that India is free and independent with the right to frame its own constitution by a constituent assembly to be elected on the basis of adult franchise or as low a franchise as possible. This Assembly will of course satisfy the minorities legitimate interests; Mr Gandhi says that if the minorities are not satisfied then he is willing that some tribunal of the highest character and most impartial should decide the dispute. Now, apart from the impracticable character of this proposal and quite apart from the fact that it is historically and constitutionally absurd to ask ruling power to abdicate in favour of a Constituent Assembly. Apart from all that, suppose we do not agree as to the franchise according to which the Central Assembly is to be elected, or suppose we the solid body of Muslim representatives do not agree with the non-Muslim majority in the Constituent Assembly, what will happen? It is said that we have no right to disagree with regard to anything that this assembly may do in framing a national constitution of this huge sub-continent except those matters which may be

germane to the safeguards for the minorities. So we are given the privilege to disagree only with regard to what may be calleded strictlysafeguards of the rights and interests of minorities. We are also given the privilege to send our own representatives by separate electorates. Now, this proposal is basd on the assumption that as soon as this constitution comes into operation the British hand will disappear. Otherwise there will be no meaning in it. Of course, Mr Gandhi says that the constitution will decide whether the British will disappear and if so to what extent. In other words his proposal comes to this: First, give me the declaration that we are a free and independent nation then I will decide what I should give you back. Does Mr Gandhi really want the complete independence of India when he talks like this. But whether the British disappear or not, it follows that extensive powers must be transferred to the people. In the event of there being a disagreement between the majority of the Constituent Assembly and the Mussalmans, in the first instance, who will appoint the tribunal? And suppose an agreed tribunal is possible and the award is ma de and the decision given, who will, may I know, be there to see that this award is implemented or carried out in accordance with the terms of that award? And who will see that it is honoured in practice, because, we are told, the British will have parted with their power mainly or completely? Then what will be the sanction behind the award which will enforce it. We come back to the same answer, the Hindu majority would do it but will it be with the help of the British bayonet or Gandhi's "Ahinsa"? Can we trust them any more? Besides, Ladies and Gentlemen, can you imagine that a question of this character, of social contract upon which the future constitution of India would be based affecting 90 millions of Mussalmans, can be decided by means of a judicial tribunal. Still, that is the proposal of the Congress.

Before I deal with what Mr Gandhi said a few days ago I shall deal with the pronouncements of some of the other Congress leaders—each one speaking with a different voice. Mr Rajgopala achariya, the ex-Prime Minister of Madras says that the only panacea for Hindu-Muslim unity is joint electorates. That is his prescription as one of the great doctors of the Congress Organisation. (Laughter). Babu Rajendra Prasad on the other band only a few days ago says 'Oh, what more do the Mussalm ans want?, I will read to you his words. He says, referring to the miniority question:

"If Britain would concede our right of self-determination surely all these differences would disappear". How will our

difference disappear? He does not explain or enlighten us about it.

"But so long as Britain remained and held power the differences would continue to exist. The Congress had made it clear that the future constitution would be framed not by the Congress alone but by representatives of all political parties and religious groups. The Congress has gone further and declared that the minorities can have their representatives elected for this purpose by separate electorates, though the Congress regards separate electorates as an evil. It will be representative of all the peoples of this country, irrespective of their religion and political affiliations, who will be deciding the future constitution of India and not this or that party. What better guarantees can the minorities have?" So according to Babu Rajendra Prasad the moment we enter the Assembly we shall shed all our political affiliations, and religions and everything else. This is what Babu Rajendra Prasad said as late as 18th March, 1940. And this is now what Mr Gandhi said on the the 20th of March, 1940, He says:

"To me Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Harijans, are all alike. I cannot be frivolous"—but I think he is frivolous—"I cannot be frivolous when I talk of Quaid-i-Azam Jinnah. He is my brother."

The only difference is that brother Gandhi has three votes and I have only one vote. (Laughter).

"I would be happy indeed if he could keep me in his pocket". I do not know really what to say to this latest offer of his.

"There was a time when I could say that there was no Muslim whose confidence I did not enjoy. It is my misfortune that it is not so today."

Why has he lost the confidence of the Muslims today? May I ask Ladies and Gentlemen?

"I do not read all that appears in the Urdu Press, but perhaps I get a lot of abuse there. I am not sorry for it. I still believe that without Hindu-Muslim settlement there can be no Swaraj."

Mr Gandhi has been saying this now for the last 25 years.

"You will perhaps ask in that case why do I talk of a fight. I do so because it is to be a fight for a Constituent Assembly."

He is fighting the British. But may I point out to Mr Gandhi and the Congress that you are fighting for a Constituent

Assembly which the Muslims say we cannot accept, which the Muslims say, means three to one, about which the Mussalmans say that they will never be able, in that way by the counting of heads, to come to any agreement which will be real agreement from the hearts, which will enable us to work as friends and, therefore, this idea of a Constituent Assembly is objectionable, apart from other objections. But he is fighting for the Constituent Assembly, not fighting the Mussalmans at all!

"I do so because it is to be a light for a Constituent Assembly. If Muslims who come to the Constituent Assembly". Mark the words, "who come to the Constituent Assembly through Muslim votes"—he is forcing us to come to that Assembly—"declare that there is nothing common between Hindus and Muslims then alone I would give up all hopes, but even then I would agree with them because they read the Quran and I have also studied something of that Holy Book." (Laughter.)

So he wants the Constituent Assembly for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the Mussalmans and if they do not agree then he will give up all hopes, but even then he will agree with us. (Laughter). Will, I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is this the way to show any real genuine desire, if there existed any, to come to a settlement with the Mussalmans? (Voices of no, no). Why does not Mr Gandhi agree, and I have suggested to him more than once and I repeat it again from this platform, why does not Mr Gandhi honestly now acknowledge that that the Congress is a Hindu Congress, that he does not represent anybody except the solid body of Hindu people? Why should not Mr Gandhi be proud to say, a "I am a Hindu, Congress has solid Hindu backing"? I am not ashamed of saying that I am a Mussalman. (Hear, hear and applause). I am right and I hope and I think even a blind man must have been convinced by now that the Muslim League has the solid backing of the Mussalmans of India. (Hear, hear). Why then all this camoulfage? Why all these machinations? Why all these methods to coerce the British to overthrow the Musslmans? Why this declaration of non-cooperation? Why this threat of civil disobedience? And why fight for a Constituent Assembly for the sake of ascertaining whether the Mussalmans agree or they do not agree? (Hear, hear). Why not come as a Hindu leader proudly representing your people and let me meet you proudly representing the Mussalmans (Hear, hear and applause). This is all that I have to say so far as the Congress is concerned.

So far as the British Government is concerned, our negotiations are not concluded yet as you know. We had asked for

assurances on several points, at any rate we have made some advance with regard to one point and that is this. You remember our demand was that the entire problem of future constitution of India should be examined *de novo*, apart from the Government of India Act of 1935. To that the Viceroy's reply, with the authority of His Majesty's Government was—I had better quote that—I will not put it in my own words: This is the reply that was sent to us on 23rd December:

"My answer to your first question is that the declaration I made with the approval of His Majesty's Government on October 13th last doe is not exclude" Mark the words.—"does not exclude examination of any parteither of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based."

As far as our internal position is concerned, we have also been examining it and, you know, there are several schemes which have been sent by various well informed constitutionalists and others who take interest in problem of India's future constitution, and we have also appointed a sub-committee to examine the details of the schemes that have come in so far. But one thing is quite clear, it has always been taken for granted mistakenly that the Mussalmans are a minority and of course we have got used to it for such a long time that these settled notions sometimes are very difficult to remove. The Mussalmans are not a minority. The Mussalmans are a nation by any definition. The British and particularly the Congress proceed on the basis, "Well, you are a minority after all, what do you want". "What else do the minorities want", just as Babu Rajendra Prasad said. But surely the Mussalmans are not a minority. We find that even according to the British map of India we occupy large parts of this country, where the Mussalmans are in a majority—such as Bengal, Punjab, N.-W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan.

Now the question is, what is the best solution of this problem between the Hindus and the Mussalmans? We have been considering, and as I have already said, a committee has been appointed to consider the various proposals. But whatever the final scheme of constitution, I will present to you my views and I will just read to you, in confirmation of what I am going to put before you, a letter from Lala Lajpat Rai to Mr C.R. Das. It was written, I believe, about 12 to 15 years ago and that letter has been produced in a book by one Indra Prakash recently published and that is how this letter has come to light. This is what Lala Lajpat Rai, a very astute politician and a staunch Hindu Mahasabite said. But before I read his letter it is

plain from that you cannot get away from being a Hindu if you are a Hindu. (Laughter). The word "Nationalist" has now become the play of conjurers in politics. This is what he says:

"There is one point more which has been troubling me very much of late and one which I want you to think carefully and that is the question of Hindu-Muhammadan unity. I have devoted most of my time during the last six months to the study of Muslim history and Muslim law and I am inclined to think it is neither possible nor practicable. Assuming and admitting the sincerity of Muhammadan leaders in the non-cooperation movement, I think their religion provides an effective bar to anything of the kind.

"You remember the conversation I reported to you in Calcutta which I had with Hakim Ajmal Khan and Dr Kitchlew. There is no finer Muhammadan in Hindustan than Hakim Ajmal Khan, but can any Muslim leader override the Quran? I can only hope that my reading of Islamic law is incorrect."

I think his reading is quite correct (Laughter).

"And nothing would relieve me more than to be convinced that it is so. But if it is right then it comes to this, that although we can unite against the British we cannot do so to rule Hindustan on British lines. We cannot do so to rule Hindustan on democratic lines."

Ladies and Gentlemen, when Lala Lajpat Rai said that we cannot rule this country on democratic lines it was alright but when I had the temerity to speak the same truth about 18 months ago there was a shower of attacks and criticism. But Lala Lajpat Rai said 15 years ago that we cannot do so, viz. rule Hindustan on democratic lines. What is the remedy? The remedy according to Congress is to keep us in the minority and under the majority rule. Lala Lajpat Rai proceeds further:

"What is then the remedy? I am not afraid of the seven crores of Mussalmans. But I think the seven crores in Hindustan *plus* the armed hosts of Afghanistan, Central Asia, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Turkey, will be irresistible." (Laughter).

"I do honestly and sincerely believe in the necessity or desirability of Hindu-Muslim unity. I am also fully prepared to trust the Muslim leaders. But what about the injunctions of the Quran and Hadis? The leaders cannot override them. Are we then doomed? I hope not. I hope your learned mind and wise head will find some way out of this difficulty."

A leading journal like the London Times, commenting on the Government of India Act of 1935, wrote that "undoubtedly

the difference between the Hindus and Muslims is not of religion in the strict sense of the word but also of law and culture, that they may be said indeed to represent two entirely distinct and separate civilisations. However, in the course of time the superstitions will die out and India will be moulded into a single nation". (So according to the London Times the only difficulties are superstitions). These fundamental and deeprooted differences, spiritual, economic, cultural, social and political have been euphemised as mere "superstitions". But surely, it is a flagrant disregard of the past history of the sub-continent of India as well as the fundamental Islamic conception of society *vis-a-vis* that of Hinduism to characterise them as mere "superstitions". Notwithstanding a thousand years of close contact, nationalities which are as divergent today as ever, cannot at any time be expected to transform themselves into one nation merely by means of subjecting them to a democratic constitution and holding them forcibly together by unnatural and artificial methods of British Parliamentary statutes. What the unitary government of India for 150 years had failed to achieve cannot be realised by the imposition of a central federal government. It is inconceivable that the fiat or the writ of a government so constituted can ever command a willing and loyal obedience throughout the sub-continent by various nationalities except by means of armed force behind it.

The problem in India is not of an intercommunal character, but manifestly of an international one, and it must be treated as such. So long as this basic and fundamental truth is not realised, any constitution that may be built will result in disaster and will prove destructive and harmful not only to the Mussalmans, but to the British and Hindus also. If the British Government are really in earnest and sincere to secure peace ana happiness of the people of this sub-continent, the only course open to us all is to allow the major nations separate homelands by dividing India into "autonomous national states". There is no reason why these states should be antagonistic to each other. On the other hand the rivalry and the natural desire and efforts on the part of one to dominate the social order and establish political supremacy over the other in the government of the country will disappear. It will lead more towards natural goodwill by international pacts between them, and they can live in complete harmony with their neighbours. This will lead further to a friendly settlement all the more easily with regard to minorities by reciprocal arrangements and adjustments between Muslim India and Hindu India, which will far more adequately and effectively safeguard the the rights and interests of Muslim and

various other communities.

It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.

History has presented to us many examples such as the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Czechoslovakia and Poland. History has also shown to us many geographical tracts much smaller than the sub-continent of India, which otherwise might have been called one country but which have been divided into as many states as there are nations inhabiting them. Balkan Peninusula comprises as many as 7 or 8 sovereign states. Likewise, the Portuguese and the Spanish stand divided in the Iberian Peninsula. Whereas under the plea of unity of India and one nation which does not exist, it is sought to pursue here the line of one central government when we know that the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during these ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India. The present artificial unity of India dates back only to the British conquest and is maintained by the British bayonet but the termination of the British regime, which is implicit in the recent declaration of His Majesty's Government, will be the herald of the entire break up with worse disaster than have ever taken place during the last one thousand years under Muslims. Surely that is not the legacy which Britain would be queath to India after 150 years of her rule, nor would Hindu and Muslim India risk such

a sure catastrophe.

Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind of which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years and any repetition of such a government must lead to civil war and raising of private armies as recommended by Mr Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur when he said that they must defend themselves violently or non-violently, blow for blow, and if they could not they must emigrate.

Mussalmans are not a minority as it is commonly known and understood. One has only got to look round. Even today according to the British map of India, out of 11 provinces 4 provinces, where the Muslims dominate more or less, are functioning notwithstanding the decision of the Hindu Congress High Command to non-cooperate and prepare for civil disobedience. Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homeland, their territory and their state. We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals and according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands and the vital interest of millions of our people impose a sacred duty upon us to find an honourable and peaceful solution, which would be just and fair to all. But at the same time we cannot be moved or diverted from our purpose and objective by threats or intimidations. We must be prepared to face all difficulties and consequences, make all the sacrifices that may be required of us to achieve the goal we have set in front of us.

86

Text of the Pakistan Resolution passed at the Twenty-seventh Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Lahore, 24 March, 1940

While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim

League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th September and 22nd of October, 1939, and 3rd of February, 1940 on the constitutional issue, this Session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in, the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October, 1939 made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act, 1935, is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North Western and Eastern Zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units should be autonomous and sovereign.

That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, com-

munications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary.

87

Resolution on association with War Efforts passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 15-17 June, 1940

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, while being of the opinion that further clarification contained in the letter of His Excellency the Viceroy, dated the 19th of April, 1940, with regard to the assurances asked for by the All-India Muslim League is not satisfactory, endorses the following from the statement issued by the President, Mr M.A. Jinnah, to the Press on the 27th of May, 1940:

"Upto the present moment, we have not created any difficulty nor have we embarrassed the British Government in the prosecution of the war.

The Provinces where the Muslim League has a dominant voice have been left free to cooperate with the British Government, pending their consideration with regard to the assurances we have asked for, and in particular that the British Government should make no declaration regarding the future constitutional problems of India and the vital issues that have been raised in that connection without our approval and consent.

Nevertheless, without prejudice to the adjustment of the larger issues later on, we were even willing as far back as November last, to consider the proposal of the Viceroy to bring about an honourable and workable adjustment in the provincial field, which would have been followed up with our representatives being appointed to the Executive Council of the Central Government to the extent permissible within the frame-work of the present constitution and existing law.

But this proposal was summarily rejected by Mr Gandhi and the Congress.

A similar attempt was again made by His Excellency early in February, which met the same fate. Since then it seems that the Viceroy has been waiting for the Congress to pass its word.

With regard to Mr Amery's statement and the broadcast appeal of His Excellency the Viceroy, may I say that it is upto the British Government to show trust in Muslim Leadership,

there are many ways of doing so and, as confident friends seek our whole-hearted cooperation. And we shall not fail."

The Working Committee looks with alarm upon the growing menace of Nazi aggression which has been most ruthlessly depriving one nation after another of its liberty and freedom and regards the unprovoked attack by the Italian Government against the Allies, as most unwarranted and immoral at a time when France was engaged in a brave struggle against very heavy odds.

The grave world situation demands serious efforts on the part of every Indian for the defence of his country and the working Committee calls upon the Government of India to prepare the country in an organised manner to meet every eventuality. The Committee is constrained to state that the proposals for the defence of India indicated in the statements of Their Excellencies the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief as well as the statements of some provincial Governors are wholly inadequate to meet the urgent requirements of the situation. The Committee, therefore, authorise its President to enter into communication with His Excellency the Viceroy with a view to explore the possibility of devising adequate and effective measures to mobilize the country's resources for the purpose of intensifying war efforts and the defence of India. The Committee is of the view that unless a satisfactory basis for close cooperation is agreed upon on an all-India basis and not Province-wise between the government and the Muslim League and such other parties as are willing to undertake the responsibility for the defence of the country in the face of imminent danger the real purpose and objective will not be served and achieved.

The Working Committee is of the opinion that in view of the immediate grave danger that is facing the country the real purpose will not be served by the Mussalmans and others merely joining the proposed provincial and district war committees with their present scope and functions.

In view of the numerous enquiries that have been received from the various provincial and district Leagues and individual members seeking guidance and instructions as to what course they should adopt towards the proposed War Committees announced by His Excellency the Viceroy and some Governors, the Working Committee is of opinion that at present Mussalmans should not serve on these Committees and should await further instructions from the President pending the result of the communication with the Viceroy.

88

Correspondence between Quaid-i-Azam and the Viceroy Lord Linlithgow

From Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy

New Delhi,
February 23, 1940.

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I placed the whole correspondence that had passed between Your Excellency and myself, ending with your letter dated December 23, 1939, before the meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League on February 3, 1940.

As was desired by Your Excellency in our conversation on February 6, I now beg to state briefly the views of the Working Committee, which are as follows:

The Working Committee appreciate the clarification made by Your Excellency regarding the first point and are glad to note that the declaration made by Your Excellency, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, on October 18, 1939, does not exclude the examination of any part either of the Act of 1935 or of the policy and plans on which it is based.

As regards the second point, the Working Committee do not feel satisfied as the request made for a definite assurance has not been met, namely, that no declaration should either in principle or otherwise, be made or any constitution be enforced by His Majesty's Government or enacted by Parliament without the approval andc onsent of the Mussalmans of India. We recognise Your Excellency's assurance when you state "His Majesty's Government are not under any misapprehension as to the importance of the contentment of the Muslim community to the stability and success of any constitutional development in India. You need, therefore, have no fear that the weight which your community's position in India necessarily gives their views will be underrated". But I regret to say, this does not meet the point raised by the Muslim League, because it still leaves the position of the ninety million Mussalmans of India only in the region of consultation and counsel, and vests the final decision in the hands of Great Britain to determine the fate and future of Muslim India. We regret that we cannot accept this position.

As to the policy for Palestine, the Working Committee

of the All-India Muslim League wish to impress upon His Majesty's Government that a solution should be found to the satisfaction of the Arabs. The Committee are glad to note, as Your Excellency states, that His Majesty's Government have endeavoured to meet all reasonable Arab demands, and they continue to be fully alive to that issue. But the eyes of the Muslim world are watching the situation keenly and a definite solution should be found without delay.

With regard to the use of Indian troops against any Muslim Power or country, the Committee feel that Your Excellency has misunderstood the position. When we asked for an assurance that Indian troops will not be used outside India against any Muslim Power or country, it was not intended that they shall not be used for the defence of the country in case of an attack on, or aggression against India. While we thank Your Excellency for informing us that every precaution has been taken by His Majesty's Government, at the instance of the Government of India, to ensure that Muslim feeling in India on this matter is fully respected, we feel that further clarification of the position is necessary.

It is required of the Muslim League to give assurance of wholehearted cooperation and active support on behalf of the Mussalmans of India to the British Government for the purpose of prosecution of the war. The Committee are of opinion that before doing that they must feel confident that the future of the Mussalmans of India is not left in the region of uncertainty or doubtful possibility. Consequently, we do not consider it unreasonable on our part to ask for a definite assurance that no commitments will be made with regard to the future constitution of India or any interim settlement with any other party without our approval and consent. If His Majesty's Government are prepared to treat the leadership of the Mussalmans as a resposible body, then they must be trusted, especially where the question of determining their own future is concerned.

We are constrained to state that Your Excellency is unnecessarily over-anxious about the interests of other communities. It has never been our desire unjustly to harm any community. The issues that have been raised by us are due to apprehensions that the British Government may be stampeded by other powerful organisations in the country into adopting a course or agreeing to a settlement in the matter of India's constitution which may prove not only highly detrimental to the interests of the Mussalmans but may be disastrous for them.

As regards Palestine and the use of Indian troops, our de-

mands, as explained by me above, cannot in any way prejudice the interests of any other community. It is not possible in a letter of this kind to state fully the various reasons and details; but, if Your Excellency so desires, I shall be very glad to place the views of the Committee before you in fuller details at an early date, whenever Your Excellency finds it convenient.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

From the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Azam

April 19, 1940.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

I was glad to gather from your letter of February 24, that my letter to you of December 23 had removed some of the doubts, which had been felt by All-India Muslim League. I do not read your letter as indicating that the Working Committee of the League expects anything further from me in your points—the scope of the examination of the constitutional position to follow war and the policy in Palestine.

You ask, however, for further clarificati n of the position in regard to the use of Indian troops against Muslim Powers or countries, while explaining, as I note and appreciate, that you had no intention of attempting to circumscribe their use in defending India against attack or aggression. I presume that you do not expect a guarantee, which it would obviously be impossible to give, binding us in future contingencies which no one can foresee. But you need have no fear that if at any time such a contingency arose the consideration underlying your suggestion would be overlooked. Fortunately, however, so far as the present situation is concerned, His Majesty's Government are in friendly and sympathetic relations with all Muslim Powers to some of whom, indeed, they are bound alliance, while with the rest they are on terms of most cordial friendship.

You represent that your second po nt was not felt by the Working Committee to be adequately met by the terms of my letter. You have no doubt noticed the passage in the Secretary of State's speech on April 18 in which he used these words:

"But that does not mean that the future constitution of India is to be a constitution dictated by the Government and Parliament of this country against the wishes of the Indian people. The undertaking given by His Majesty's to examine the constitutional field in consultation with representatives of all

parties and interests in India connotes not dictation but negotiation. Admittedly a substantial measure of agreement amongst the communities in India is essential if the vision of a united India, which has inspired the labours of so many Indians and Englishmen, is to become a reality; for I cannot believe that any Government or Parliament in this country would attempt to impose by force upon, for example, 80 million Muslim subjects of His Majesty in India, a form of constitution under which they would not live peacefully and contentedly."

This statement, I am sure you will agree, has removed any possible doubts on this point.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

From Quaid-i-Azam to Viceroy

Dear Lord Lintithgow,

I am in receipt of your letter of April 19, 1940, and I thank you for it. I hope you will excuse me for the delay in replying to it before now, as I was uncertain as to what course I should adopt in the matter, especially as the appointment of the personnel of the Working Committee was pending; but I now beg to inform you that I propose to place the matter before the Working Committee costituted for the ensuing year for their consideration and will communicate their views to Your Excellency as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

From Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy's Private Secretary

Simla,
July 4, 1940.

Dear Mr Laithwaite,

I am enclosing herewith a rough note of the points I discussed with him on June 27, 1940, in the course of my interview.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

NOTE: That no pronouncement or statement should be made by His Majesty's Government which would, in any way, militate against the basic and fundamental principles laid down by the Lahore resolution of division of India and creating Muslim States in the North-West and Eastern zones; and it may

be stated that that ideal now has become the universal faith of Muslim India.

That His Majesty's Government must give definite and categorical assurances to the Mussalmans of India that no interim or final scheme of new constitution would be adopted by the British Government without the previous approval of Muslim India.

In view of the rapid developments in Europe and grave danger that is facing India, it is fully realised that everything should be done that is possible to intensify war efforts and mobilise all the resources of India for her defence for the purpose of maintaining internal security, peace and tranquillity, and to ward off external aggression. But this can only be achieved provided the British Government are ready and willing to associate the Muslim leadership as equal partners in the Government both at the Centre and in all the provinces. In other words, Muslim India leadership must be fully trusted as equals, and have equal share in the authority and control of the Government, Central and Provincial.

Provisionally and during the period of the war the following steps should be taken to comply with the formula, namely, cooperation with the Government with equal share in the authority of the Government.

(*a*) That the Executive Council of the Viceroy should be enlarged, within the framework of the present constitutional existing law, the additional number to be settled by further discussions, but it being understood that the Muslim representation must be equal to that of the Hindus if the Congress comes in, otherwise they should have the majority of the additional members, as it is obvious that the main burden and the responsibility will be borne by the Mussalmans in that case.

(*b*) In the provinces where Section 93 has to operate non-official advisers should be appointed, the number to be fixed after further discussion, and the majority of the non-official advisers should be the representatives of Mussalmans; and where the provinces can be run by combination of parties or 'coalition', naturally it would be for the parties concerned to adjust matters by agreement among themselves.

(*c*) There should be a War Council consisting of not less than fifteen members, including the President, to be presided over by His Excellency the Viceroy. I don't like the expression "War Consultative Committee." This Council should regularly

meet to deal with, and review, the general situation as it may develop from time to time, and advise the Government with regard to matters in connection with the prosecution of the war generally, and in particular, the fullest development of the defence possible. and finance, and to make a thorough economic and industrial drive. In this body it will not be difficult to secure the representation and full cooperation of the Indian Princes, and as far as I can judge, they would have no difficulty in joining it. It is through this body that the association of the Princes can be secured. Here again, the represention of Muslim India must be equal to that of the Hindus if the Congress comes in, otherwise they should have the majority.

Finally, the representatives of the Mussalmans on the proposed War Council and the Executive Council of the Governor-Geenral, and the additional non-official advisers of the Governors, should be chosen by the Muslim League.

From the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Azam

Simla,
July 6, 1940.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

I am much obliged for the private and personal memorandum headed "tentative proposal" which you were kind enough to send me in your letter to my private secretary on July 1. I note the points taken in paragraph one of that memorandum, and in the first sentence of paragraph two, both of which you emphasised in our recent conversation. I welcome also the amplification, as putting me in fuller possession of your mind, of that conversation represented by the balance of your letter. But certain of the points suggest that there may be some slight misapprehension, which you will, I think, agree that it would be desirable that I should clear without delay.

As regards the expansion of my Executive Council, this would, as you rightly observe in your memorandum, be within the existing constitutional scheme. In other words, any Council so expanded would cooperate as a whole and as a single Government of India. It is not a case of striking a balance between the different interests or of preserving the proportions between the important parties. As you yourself indicated in the course of our conversation, there are parties other than either Congress or the Muslim League who may fairly claim to be considered for inclusion, and there is a very definite limit of numbers to any possible expansion.

At the same time I readily accept the importance, in the

event of any expansion, of securing adequate representation of Muslim interests, and that is a point which I would bear in mind. There is, however, as you will see from my explanation, no question of responsibility falling in greater or less degree on any particular section. Responsibility will be that of the Governor-General-in-Council as a whole. Again, it will be clear that under the existing law and practice it must remain with the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Governor-General's Executive Council, and such persons cannot be the nominees of political parties, however important; though it may, of course, be assumed that both the Secretary of State and the Governor-General would, in all cases, do their utmost to select persons from the various sections of the community.

I need not remind you that under law the whole responsibility for Government in section 93 provinces vests exclusively in the Governor, although a Governor can, of course, take advantage of the assistance of any advisers he mey appoint. Whether, and if so at what point and in what strength, non-official advisers from political parties should be appointed in provinces under section 93 administration, in the event of an expansion of the Governor-General's Counicl, would clearly call for consideration in the light of circumstances of each province. You will, I think, agree with me also that the importance of the community from which advisers are drawn in a particular province has a direct bearing. Your idea for a War Council is, in my view. well worthwhile considering, though details would have to be worked out. Here again there are, of course, many pa ties to be considered other than the Muslim League or Congress.

As regards section III of your memorandum, I ought, I think, to make it clear that it would be constitutionally impossible for the choice of Muslim gentlemen to be appointed to any expanded Executive Council or as non-official advisers to rest with the Muslim League. But in the contigency envisaged you need not fear that any suggestions you may put forward would not receive full consideration.

Let me in conclusion thank you again for your very clear and valuable memorandum. I realise, of course, fully that it is not merely private and personal, but that, in your own words, it embodies a tentative proposal. I am sure that you will agree with me that it is well that there should no misunderstanding on the important points on which I have touched above.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow,

From Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy

Bombay,
July 17, 1940.

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am in receipt of your letter of July 6, 1940, and thank you for it.

As regards the constitutional and legal position that you have been goo l enough to point out to me in connection with the expansion of the Executive Council, and also with regard to the appointment of advisers to the Governor and the position of the Governor, working under section 93 I fully appreciate it.

I am glad that the idea of constituting a War Council, in your opinion, is well worthwhile considering. No doubt, the details would have to be worked out. But I do not think there is anything in my memorandum which cannot be given effect to by way of convention and, if the Secretary of State and yourself meet us in the spirit of trust and cooperation, the legal and constitutional formalities can be met and complied with. What is required is the spirit of complete understanding

I am, however, grateful to you for your assurance in paragraph five of your letter, with regard to the choice of Muslim gentlemen to be appointed to the Executive Council or as non-official advisers, which runs as follows; "But in the contingency envisaged you need not fear that any suggestion you may put forward would not receive full consideration". On my part, I hope that I shall meet you in every reasonable way possible.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah

Viceroy's letter to Quaid-i-Azam en route to Poona

August 5, 1940.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

I have had the advantage of recent discussion with you in regard to the general political situation in India, and I have reported our conversations on the matter to His Majesty's Government, with whom also I have been in consultation as to the desirability of some further statement designed to remove misunderstandings and further to clarify their intentions in the constitutional field. I am glad to say that I have now been authorised to make the statement of which I enclose a copy. It will be published in the morning papers of Thursday August 8,

and I would ask you to treat it as entirely secret and for your personal information until then.

As you will see His Majesty's Government have authorised me to invite a certain number of representative Indians to join my Executive Council, and they have authorised me further to establish a War Advisory Council which would meet at regular intervals and which would contain representatives of the Indian States and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole. I trust sincerely that you and the organisation of which you are the President will be prepared to join with me in the Central Government and in the War Advisory Council; and I would greatly appreciate it if you are able to let me have a reply by August 21 at the latest. I would hope to have an opportunity of conversation with you in Bombay on August 13, and I suggest that this would be a convenient opportunity to clear the ground for your formal reply. I would only add that I am anxious that the names of the expanded Executive Council should appear not later than the end of August, and those of the War Advisory Council by the middle of September at the latest and if possible earlier than that date.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow

From the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Azam

August 14, 1940.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

I think it may be convenient for you to have in writing the information on the points below which I gave you in our conversation: First that my statement clearly safeguarded the Muslim position in relation to future constitutional development: secondly, that it equally provided a basis on which the Muslims could, if they so desired, cooperate at the Centre. As I explained to you in our earlier conversation, cannot yet take up the issue of the provinces: but I do not contemplate non-cfficial advisers at any rate at this stage.

You asked me the probable strength of the expanded Executive Council. I cannot, for reasons which you will appreciate, yet indicate a precise figure, but the total strength of the Council will be likely to be in the neighbourhood of 11. If, as I trust, the Muslim League are prepared to accept my invitation, I would like you to let me have a panel of names, say four, with a view to my selecting two from it for appointment to my Council. As I have already made clear to you, Sir Zafrulla Khan, if he remains in my Council, will not count against this figure. It is

clearly impossible until the discussions on which I am at present engaged are complete to indicate precisely what would be the parties represented in the expanded Council.

The strength and composition of the War Advisory Council can clearly only be fixed after the expansion of the Executive Council is complete. Here, too, I should be grateful if you would be good enough to let me have a panel of names for my consideration on the assumption that there would probably be, say, five Muslim League representatives out of a total of something in the neighbourhood of 20.

As you will appreciate, I am very anxious to take very early decisions in these matters and to reach finality as regards the personnel of the expanded Executive Council and of the Advisory Council at as early a date as possible, and I hope that you will be able to assist me by letting me have a very early reply.

There is, of course, no objection whatever to your communicating the information above to your colleagues confidentially, but I should be grateful if any publicity could be avoided for the present.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

From the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Azam

Simla,
September 25, 1940.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

You asked me yesterday to let you have a formal reply before you left for Delhi to the resolutions which you were kind enough to send me earlier this month, and I accordingly send you a formal letter herewith. I have given the most careful consideration since we parted last night as to whether I could devise any form of words such as you mentioned to me which would meet the purpose which you had in view. I warned you, as you will remember, that I anticipated the greatest difficulty in doing so, and I am bound to confess with regret that I have in fact after the most careful thought found it impracticable. But, knowing your mind as I do, I have endeavoured in the last paragraph of my formal letter sent herewith to do what I could to make the general position clear, and I hope that that may be of assistance to you. I trust that in the light of our talks you will now be able to let me have a definite decision once your meeting at Delhi is over, and I trust that that decision may be a favour-

able one for matters have now reached a stage at which it is essential that a definite conclusion should be reached.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

From the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Azam

Simla,
September 25, 1940.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

I duly received the resolutions of the Working Committee of the Muslim League passed at their meetings in Bombay, on September 2.

I have, I think, made the general position perfectly clear in the course of our conversation, and it is unnecessary for me to enter into further detail about it here. As regards certain specific matters, I would, however, put on record that I explained to you the constitutional reasons which make it essential that the choice of members of the Governor-Ceneral's Executive Council must rest exclusively with the Governor-General and the Secretary of State, with whom it must rest to tender advice in this matter to His Majesty. I appreciate, however, the difficulties which, you made it clear to me, confronted you in connection with the formation of the panel which I had earlier suggested to you, and in the light of our discussion I am content that the selection of representatives, while resting with the Governor-General, should be based, in the case of the Muslim League (and, should they so desire, of the other parties to be represented in my Council) not on a panel formally submitted, but on confidential discussion between the leader of the party concerned and myself.

I have also indicated the impracticability of a final decision as to the total strength of the expanded Council or as to the allocation of portfolios (a matter which must, of course, rest entirely with the Governor-General) until the replies of all those who may be invited to serve have been received. But I have made clear to you (as I have also to the leaders of the other parties whom I have recently seen) my attitude on both those issues.

The general position of His Majesty's Government had been made clear in my statement of August 8 and in the Secretary of State's speech in the House of Commons on August 15; it is that His Majesty's Government regard the expansion of my Council and the constitution of a War Advisory Council as steps of the first importance in terms of the association of Indian

public opinion with the conduct of the war by the Central Government and of the constitutional machinery of the Government of India pending the post-war investigations, the machinery for which has been indicated in my statement and in Mr Amery's speech. His Majesty's Government sincerely trust that the Muslim League, like the other parties and interests which they have invited to join the expanded Council and to participate in the War Advisory Council, will respond to that invitation. Their collaboration in both those bodies will, of course, be entirely without prejudice to the consideration and decision after the conclusion of the war, and on the basis already indicated in my statement, of the main constitutional issue. But His Majesty's Government trust and anticipate that they and the other parties who are represented in the expanded Council and War Advisory Council will welcome the opportunity offered to them of influencing the cause of public affairs in the immensely important period which lies ahead, and, in so doing, will, in the working throughout the period of the war of those bodies, find a basis for that general cooperation, with full regard to the interests of all concerned, on which the post-war constitution foreshadowed in my statement and in the Secretary of State's speech can be built.

Yours sincerely,
Linlithgow.

From Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy

New Delhi,
September 26, 1940.

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 25, 1940, in reply to the resolution of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League on September 2, which was despatched to you with my covering letter of September 5.

I shall place the matter before the Committee on September 28, and let you have the reply as possible.

Yours sincerely,
M. A. Jinnah.

From Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy

New Delhi,
September 26, 1940.

Dear Lord Linlithgow,

I think you for you letter of September 25 and I extremely regret that you are unable to meet me on the point which I raised

during the course of our conversation on the 24th, though in the course of the discussions you appreciated and recognised that it was a vital point so far as the Muslim League was concerned, namely, that in the event of any other party deciding later on to be associated with your Executive Council to assist in the prosecution of war it should be allowed to do so on terms that may be approved of and consented to by the Muslim League party, as we were entering into, so to say, a "war contract".

I thank you for your endeavour in the last paragraph of your formal letler to do what you could to make the general position clear, but, I am afraid, it does not meet the point raised by me and I cannot derive much assistance from it.

Yours sincerely,
M. A. Jinnah.

89

Extracts from Viceroy's Statement of August 8, 1940

It is clear that the earlier differences which had prevented the achievement of national unity remain unbridged. Deeply as His Majesty's Government regret this, they do not feel that they should any longer, because of these differences, postpone the expansion of the Governor-General's Council, and the establishment of a body which will more closely associate Indian public opinion with the conduct of the war by the Central Government.

They have authorised me accordingly to invite a certain number of representative Indians to join my Executive Council. They have authorised me, further, to establish a War Advisory Council which would contain representatives of the Indian states, and of other interests in the national life of India as a whole.

The conversations which have taken place, and the resolutions of the bodies which I have just mentioned, make it clear, however, that there is still, in certain quarters, doubt as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government for the constitutional future of India, and that there is doubt, too, as to whether the position of the minorities, whether political or religious, is sufficiently safeguarded in relation to any constitutional change, by the assurance already given. . . . .

His Majesty's Government's concern, that full weight should be given to the views of the minorities in any revision, has also been brought out. That remains the position of His Majesty's

Government. It goes without saying that they could not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities, for the peace and welfare of India, to any system of Government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life.

Nor could they be parties to the coercion of such elements into submission to such a Government.

The second point of general interest is the machinery for building, within the British Commonwealth of Nations, a new constitutional scheme, when the time comes. There has been very strong insistence that the framing of that scheme should be primarily the responsibility of Indians themselves, and should originate from Indian conceptions of the social, economic and political structure of Indian life.

His Majesty's Government are in sympathy with that desire, and wish to see it given the fullest practical expression, subject to the due fulfilment of the obligations, which Great Britain's long connection with India has imposed upon her, and for which His Majesty's Government cannot divest themselves of the responsibility.

It is clear that a moment when the Commonwealth is enagaged in struggle for existence is not one in which fundamental constitutional issues can be decisively resolved, but His Majesty's Government authorise me to declare that they will most readily assent to the setting up, after the conclusion of the war, with the least possible delay, of a body, representative of the principal elements in India's eational life, in order to devise the framework of the new constitution, and they will lend every aid in their power to hasten the decision on all relevant matters to the utmost degree.

90

Extracts from the Speech of Mr Amery, Secretary of State for India

It is true that they (Congress) are numerically the largest single party in British India. But their claim, in virtue of that fact, to speak for India is utterly denied by very important elements in India's complex national life. These other elements assert their right to be regarded, not as mere numerical minorities but as separate constituent factors in any future Indian policy, entitled to be treated as such, in any discussions for the shaping of India's future constitution.

The foremost among these elements stands the great Muslim community, of ninety million strong and constituting a majority both in North-Western and North-Eastern India, but scattered as a minority over the whole sub-continent. In religious and social outlook, in historic tradition and culture, the difference between them and their Hindu fellow-countrymen goes as deep, if not deeper, than any similar difference in Europe. That need not and does not prevent pleasant social intercourse or fruitful political cooperation. It has not, in fact, prevented individual Muslims taking an active part in the work of the Congress Party.

But, as a body, the Muslims have stood aloof. Their quarrel with the scheme of the existing Act is not that it fails to give that clear majority rule which the Congress asks for, but that it would give too great powers to a Hindu majority at the Centre. They will have nothing to do with a constitution framed by a constituent assembly elected by a majority vote in geographical constituencies. They claim the right in any constitutional discussions to be regarded as an entity and are determined only to accept a constitution whose actual structure will secure their position as an entity against the operations of a mere numerical majority.

The same, though in a lesser degree perhaps, applies to the great body of what are known as the Scheduled Castes, who feel, in spite of Mr Gandhi's earnest endeavours on their behalf, that as a community they stand outside the main body of Hindu community which is represented by the Congress. . . .

His Majesty's Government have made it clear that they could not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life. In this matter, too, there is no departure from the principles which have governed the coming into existence of every Dominion constitution. In every case in the Dominions, there has been antecedent agreement, not only between the geographical units but also between the main racial elements—English and French in Canada, British and Boer in South Africa—both as to the method of framing the constitution and as to the constitution itself.

Agreement, consent, is indeed the foundation of all free government, of all true democracy. Decision by majority is not so much of the essence of democracy as a practical convenience, which presupposes for its proper working an antecedent general consent to the constitution itself. It has, indeed, in most federal

constitutions been limited in various ways in order to safeguard the separate interests of the federating elements.

To describe the need for such agreement as a veto on constitutional progress is, I think, to do an injustice to the patriotism and sense of responsibility of those concerned. Agreement means not veto by any elements but compromise, and willingness to compromise in India, as elsewhere, is an essential test of the sense of responsibility on which free government must be based.

On the other hand, within the limitations imposed by the necessity of securing agreement, the whole constitutional field is open to re-examination. It may, indeed, prove to be the case that it is by entirely novel departures from the existing scheme, whether in the relation of the Centre to the provinces or to the States or in the methods of election and representation, that an agreement can be reached which is unattainable within the framework of the existing Act, based as it is on the traditions of India's administrative past and on our customary British constitutional conceptions.

91

Resolutions on the Viceroy's Statement passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 1-2 September, 1940

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have given their most earnest and careful consideration to the statement issued by His Excellency the Viceroy on the 8th of August, 1940, and the authoritative amplification and clarification of it by Mr Amery, the Secretary of State for India, on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the course of the India debate in the House of Commons on the 14th of August, 1940. The Committee consider that these pronouncements constitute a considerable progressive advance towards the approach of the point of view and the position taken up by the All-India Muslim League on behalf of Muslim India regarding the problem of the future constitution of India; and the Committee also note with satisfaction that His Majesty's Government have, on the whole, practically met the demand of the Muslim League for a clear assurance to the effect, that no future constitution, interim or final, should be adopted by the British Government without their approval and consent.

The Working Committee appreciate that His Majesty's Government have conceded the principle urged upon them by

the Muslim League that in order to secure genuine and full support of Muslim India and such other parties as are and have been ready and willing to undertake the responsibility and are prepared to make every contribution to the intensification of the war efforts, and for the defence of India, with a view to meet any external danger or aggression and to maintain internal security and peace, they should forthwith associate the representatives of the Muslim League with authority and power as partners in the Central and Provincial Governments and establish a War Council which will include the Indian Princes and thus secure their cooperation also.

The Committee, therefore, are glad that His Majesty's Government, provisionally and during the prosecution of the War, have decided upon the expansion of the Executive Council of the Governor-General and the establishment of a War Advisory Council on an All-India basis, though they regret that His Majesty's Government have declared that they at this stage do not contemplate non-official advisers in the Provinces, which are at present administered by the Governors under Section 93 of the Government of India Act. The Committee, however, find that the specific offer now made as embodied in the letter of His Excellency the Viceroy dated the 14th of August, 1940, purporting to give effect to and implement the principle of cooperation with authority in the Government as partners is most unsatisfactory and does not meet the requirements nor the spirit indicated in the resolution of this Committee of the 16th of June, 1940, which was communicated by the President to His Excellency the Viceroy by his letter of the 17th of June, 1940, nor does it meet the memorandum that was submitted to His Excellency by the President on the lst of July, 1940.

In these circumstances the Committee find it very difficult to deal with this offer for the following reasons:

(1) Neither the President nor the Committee were consulted as to the number of the proposed increase of the additional members of the Executive Council of the Governor-General.

(2) The Committee are not yet aware of the manner in which the entire Executive Council will be reconstituted.

(3) The Committee have no information as to which are the other parties with whom the Muslim League will be called upon to work.

(4) The Committee understand that the President has not been informed as to what portfolios will be assigned

to every one of these additional members. The Committee are merely asked without any further knowledge or information, except that the total number of members of the expanded Executive Council will be in the neighbourhood of 11, to send a panel of 4 out of which 2 will be selected for appointment as members of the Governor-General's Executive Council.

(5) The Committee have considered the system of panel suggested and they are of the opinion that it is open to many objections, is not desirable and does not commend itself to them.

(6) As regards the proposed "War Advisory Council" the Committee do not know its constitution, composition and functions, beyond the information that it will probably consist of about 20 members and the Committee are asked to submit a panel out of which 5 will be nominated by His Excellency the Viceroy.

In these circumstances the Committee consider the offer unsatisfactory and request His Excellency the Viceroy to reconsider the matter and hereby authorise the President to seek further information and clarification.

The Resolution of the Working Committee passed at Bombay on the 16th of June, 1940 requesting the Mussalmans generally, and in particular, the members of the Muslim League not to serve on the War Committees and to await further instructions from the President, pending the result of the negotiations with the Viceroy, was not a decision that adopted the policy of non-cooperation with the Government as has wrongly been represented by the enemies of the Muslim League; but on the contrary was intended to urge upon the Government a line of action and policy which they should adopt to secure more effective cooperation in the prosecution of the War. There were two very vital points for which the Committee have been pressing the Government namely (1) that no constitution either interim or final be adopted by His Majesty's Government without the approval and consent of Muslim India and (2) that in order to secure genuine and whole-hearted support of the Mussalmans, it was imperative that within the framework of the present constitution Muslim India leadership should be associated as a partner in the realm of the Central and Provincial Governments forthwith. As a result of the negotiations the Working Committee are glad to state that the first point has now been practically met by the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy of the 8th August, 1940 and the amplifi-

cation and clarification of that statement by Mr Amery, the Secretary of State for India, in the course of his speech on the 14th of August, 1940 in Parliament, and the Committee also note with satisfaction that the Government have accepted the principle of the second point that was urged upon them, namely "cooperation with authority and power" in the governments in order to prosecute the war successfully.

In view of these circumstances the Working Committee leave those Mussalmans, who think that they can serve any useful purpose by merely associating themselves with the War Committees, free to do so.

The Committee are of opinion that the Government should, in fact, and not merely in principle, take without delay the Muslim Leadership into their complete confidence and associate them as equal partners in charge of the reins of the Government in the Centre and in the Provinces in order to secure genuine and whole-hearted cooperation of Muslim India in the prosecution of the war successfully.

92

Resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 28 September, 1940

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League in its meeting at Bombay on the 2nd of September, 1940, after considering the letter of His Excellency the Viceroy dated the 14th of August, 1940 addressed to the President, containing the specific offer regarding the proposed expansion of the Governor-General's Executive Council and the establishment of a War Advisory Council, had requested H.E. the Viceroy to reconsider the matter and authorised the President to seek further information and clarification, particularly on the points set out in the resolutions before the Committee could deal with the offer. As a result of the communication of these resolutions to H.E. the Viceroy, he invited the President to meet him on 24th of September and after full and free discussion of the points arising out of those resolutions, H.E. was pleased to send a formal reply dated the 25th of September, 1940. After giving their most earnest and careful consideration to the whole matter, the Committee, notwithstanding their desire from the very beginning to help in the prosecution of the War and the defence of India, regret that they are unable to accept the present offer for the following reasons:

1. That the inclusion of only two representatives of the Muslim League in the proposed expansion of the Governor-General's Executive Council, of which neither the total strength nor the number of additional members has so far been definitely determined, does not give any real and substantial share in the authority of the Government at the Centre.

2. That no indication has been given as to what would be the position of the Muslim League representatives in the event of any other party deciding at a later stage to assist in the prosecution of the War, and the Government agreeing to associate it with the Executive Council, which may involve a substantial modification and reshuffling of the Executive.

3. That so far, the Government do not propose to appoint non-official advisors in those provinces which are being administered by the Governors under Section 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935. The Committee feel that without the association of the Muslim League representatives in the administration of those provinces it will not be possible to secure real and effective cooperation of the Mussalmans.

4. That the proposed War Advisory Council is yet in embryo and no information is available as to its constitution, composition and functions, except that it will probably consist of about 30 members and that the question of setting it up will be considered after the expansion of the Executive Council is complete.

5. That out of the various points raised in the resolutions of the Committee of the 2nd of September only one relating to panel has been satisfactorily met.

93

Resolution on Congress Civil Disobedience Movement passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 23 February, 1941

The Council of the All-India Muslim League is of the opinion that the Civil Disobedience Movement started by the Congress is designed to bring pressure on the British Government to resile from the position it has taken in regard to the future constitution of India relating to the Muslims and other minorities and concede to the Congress demands, which are fundamentally opposed by Muslim India as they are detrimental to its vital interest.

Mr Gandhi himself soon after the Viceroy's statement of November 5, 1939, wrote the following in the Harijan:

'So, long as there is no workable arrangement with the Muslim League civil resistance must involve resistance against the League."

The starting of Civil Resistance without an arrangement with the League under the cloak of fight for liberty of speech is only a crude method of getting over previous statements and confusing the issues. Only a few days back Mr Gandhi is reported to have addressed the Secretary, Hindu Mahasabha, in the following words:

"If the Hindu Mahasabha was so inclined, it could partake in the re-organisation of the Central Government, but the question of the Congress doing so would not arise so long as the Congress demand remained unconceded."

From the above it is clear that the Congress is fighting the British Government for the acceptance of its demands. The Council of the All-India Muslim League, therefore, have no doubt as to the real motive and object of Mr Gandhi in launching and pursuing vigorously his movement of Satyagraha and draw the attention of the British Government that if any concession to the Congress is made which adversely affects or militates against the Muslim demands it will be resisted by the Muslim League with all the power it can command and the Muslim League desires to place it on record that if the situation demands it would not hesitate to intervene and play such part in the struggle as may be necessary for the protection of the rights and interests of the Mussalmans of this country.

94

Resolution passed at the Twenty-eighth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Madras, 12-15 April, 1941

This session of the All-India Muslim League is definitely of opinion that the present Civil Disobedience Movement started by Mr Gandhi on behalf of the Congress, ostensibly for freedom of speech, is really meant to coerce the British Government to concede the Congress demands regarding the future Constitution of India, which are really and virtually for a transfer of sovereign powers to the Hindus and thus relegate the Muslim nation of 100 millions and the Indian minorities to the status of mere subjects of Hindu Raj throughout the country.

It, therefore, draws the attention of the British Government that if any constitutional change, either interim or final, is made without the approval of the Muslim League, it would constitute a flagrant breach of faith on the part of the British Government with the Mussalmans of India, and would be contrary to the solemn declarations and promises that have already been made to the Mussalmans of India by the recent pronouncements of His Excellency the Viceroy and the Secretary of State for India and His Majesty's Government ending with the declaration of 8th August, 1940 and the amplification of it by Mr Amery, the Secretary of State for India, on the 14th of August, 1940; and warns the British Government that if any attempt is made to depart from or modify in any way the above-mentioned declarations and pledges, the Mussalmans would be forced to resort to every measure and method to resist it with all the power they can command.

95

Extracts from Quaid-i-Azam's Presidential Address at the Twenty-eighth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League Madras, April 1941

. . . . We have now got to define—and define beyond doubt —what our goal is. There are many people who either do not understand or misunderstand or do not want to understand. There are ignorant people, not amongst Muslims—thank Heavens for that—and it is really amazing—I will give you one or two instances later—how our decisions or resolutions are misinterpreted or misrepresented. In order that there should be no room left for misunderstanding and that no doubt should be left in the mind of any intelligent or sensible Indian—it does not matter to which class or community he belongs—let me clarify our position with regard to our goal. What is the goal of the All-India Muslim League? What is its ideology and what its policy? Let me tell you as clearly as I can possibly define it, that the goal of the All-India Muslim League is this: We want the establishment of completely independent states in the north-west and eastern zones of India with full control finally of defence, foreign affairs, communications, customs, currency and exchange, etc. We do not want in any circumstances a constitution of an all-India character with one government at the Centre. We will never agree to that. If we once agree to that, let me tell you, the Muslims will be absolutely wiped out of existence. We shall never be tributaries of any power or any

government at the Centre so far as the north-west and eastern zones of our free national homelands are concerned.

The leadership of Hindu India has, I regret to say, been fooled. They have been bamboozled by the policy and the diplomacy of the British Government who are dangling in front of them a united all-India constitution and democracy—the two carrots before donkeys! The British Government know—and I say to the Hindu leadership, you have lost the last shred of statesmanship if you do not realise yet that the British Government know it—that Muslim India will never submit to an all-India constitution and one central government. The British statesmen know that the so-called democracy and the parliamentary system of government is nothing but a farce in the country. It is not, as some people mix up, a question of Muslims objecting to government based on the brotherhood of man, as it is often alleged by people who really do not understand what they are talking about when they talk of either democracy or Islam. Democracy means, to begin with, majority rule. Majority rule in a single nation, in a single society, is understandable, although even there it has failed. Representative government in a single nation, harmonious, homogeneous and one is understandable. But you have only got to apply your mind for a few minutes to see the truth. Can such a system ever work or succeed when you have two different nations—indeed more than two different nations—in this sub-continent, when you have two totally different societies, the Muslim society and the Hindu society? In this land of yours (meaning the Madras Province) there is another nation, the Dravidians. This land is really Dravidastan. Imagine that three per cent. of the Brahmin high caste, by skilful manoeuvring and by skilful methods of electioneering which they have studied, should secure the majority. Is this democracy or is it a force? Therefore, I give my fullest sympathy and support to the Non-Brahmins. I say to them: The only way for you is to come into your own, live your own life according to your own culture and according to your own language—thank God that Hindi did not go very far here—and your own history is to go ahead with your ideal. I have every sympathy for you and I shall do all I can to support you to establish Dravidastan. The seven per cent of Muslims will stretch their hand of friendship to you and live with you on lines of equality, justice and fairplay.

Speaking next of safeguards for minorities, Mr Jinnah said, that safeguards for minorities must be provided for, wherever there are minorities. I have always believed—and I think I am right in believing that—that no government will ever succeed

without creating a sense of security and confidence in the minorities. No government will succeed if their policy and porgramme is to be unjust, unfair and tyrannical over the minorities. The acid test of success of any government of a representative character is that the minorities must feel that they will have fairplay and justice. In that we shall not be wanting or lagging behind any civilised country in the world. I am confident that when the time comes, the minorities in our homelands will find that with our traditions, and our heritage and the teachings of Islam, not only shall we be fair and just to them but generous. (Cheers). We do not higgle-haggle. We do not believe in bargaining. We believe in action, we believe in statesmanship and in practical politics.

Referring to the ideology of the League, Mr Jinnah said that it had already been made very claear. But there were people in this country and especially there was a section of the Hindu press, who should be reminded of the same over and over again. The ideology of the League, he said, is based on the fundamental principle that Muslim India is an independent nationality. Any attempt to get them to merge their nationality or political identity or entity will not only be resisted but, in my opinion, it will be futile for anyone to attemp. it. We are determined, and let there be no mistake about it, to establish the status of an independent nation and an independent State in this sub-continent.

Explaining the policy of the League, Mr Jinnah said that it was their aim to endeavour to promote goodwill and harmony among the peoples in the land on the basis of equality, fairplay and reciprocity. This could best be secured by agreements with other peoples and parties and states and their living together as members of a comity pledged to respect each other's rights. Any ambition of domination by one over the other must be abandoned, and the sooner that was done the quicker would be the sulotion of India's problems.

The next question that is troubling us today, Mr Jinnah said, is what is known as the deadlock. . . . . After the war had broken out the first good news, along with other bad news that we got, was the declaration of the Viceroy that his Majesty's Government are pleased to suspend the All-India Federation Scheme embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935. (Cheers). It was only suspension. We know how capable our British friends are in the science of game of diplomacy. We knew that was not enough, because what was suspended may be again established at any time. Therefore, our first and foremost demand

was that it should not only be suspended but must be abandoned. After long-drawn correspondence and interviews, the Government declared that the whole problem of India's future constitution will be considered *de novo*, including the policy and the plan on which the Government of India Act of 1935 was based. That was no doubt a great relief, because it was against that part of the Act that Muslim India was fighting from the very commencement. What was the next thing that we put before the British Government? We were afraid of another thing. You know that, in spite of all our efforts, the League was not strong then as the Congress in organisation. The Congress, let me tell you, means nothing more and nothing less than a solid body of Hindus behind it. Other off-shoots and little branches (*bachas*) like the Hindu Mahasabha, the All-India Hindu League, the Liberal Federation and some other little bodies, you know, are all one. I do not say that they are one in the sense that they approve all the acts of the Congress. But if any body does represent the high class Hindus throughout India, it is the Congress. We knew that this Hindu organisation had been waiting for a long time for this war to break out. In fact, you remember, a year before, when there was a likelihood of the war breaking out, the Congress Working Committee sat in vigilance at Delhi for days and days, because as they were giving out openly, that will be the chance of their lives when they will be able to coerce the British Government successfully and wrench from them what they desired to take. We knew that this powerful organisation was waiting and watching, and therefore we wanted the British Government to make the position clear with regard to the constitution of India, and we demanded that no constitutional change, interim or final, should be made without the approval and consent of the Mussalmans of India. After long-drawn correspondence and interviews, we now have the announcement of the Viceroy of August 8 and amplified by Mr Amery on August 14. This demand is nothing less than bare justice to the ninety millions of Mussalmans in India. Could the Congress or the Hindus maintain, with any sense of justice and fairplay, that a constitution framed by the British Government joining hands with the Congress and acceptable to them should be thrust on the Muslims and that the Muslims should accept it? Is it not rank madness to say that this means a veto to the Muslim League and a charter of intransigence to Mr Jinnah and the League? I do not admit for a moment that this is a veto or a charter of intransigence. What does the other proposal mean? It really means this: the framing of a constitution of India, without the approval and consent of a constituent factor, namely, the Muslims. I repeat again that it is but bare justice that we are

asking that we must be recognised as a constituent factor and the British Government have now rightly stated that we must come to an agreement. How would the Congress like to have a constitution framed by the British Government in consultation with the Muslim League alone?

Mr Jinnah next referred to the resolution adopted by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League in June 1940, asking the Government of India to take serious steps to strengthen the defence of India and authorising Mr Jinnah to enter into communication with the Viceroy with a view to exploring and possibly devising all prompt measures to intensify war efforts. This resolution was supplemented by a memorandum which he presented to the Viceroy in July 1940. In it he had said that no pronouncement or statement should be made by the Government which would militate against the basic and fundamental principles laid down in the Lahore resolution of Pakistan, that the Government should give a definite and categorical assurance to the Muslims that no interim or final scheme of constitution should be made without the consent and approval of the Muslims of India, that in view of the grave danger to the country everything should be done to intensify the war efforts, to defend the country and to maintain internal security. They suggested then that the Viceroy's Executive Council be enlarged within the framework of the present constitution, that the additional number should be fixed after further consultation and that the Muslim representatives should be equal in number to the Congress representatives. They also suggested that in the Provinces where section 93 of the Government of India Act was in operation, non-official advisers should be appointed. They also suggested the formation of a war council intended to give representation thereon to the Indian princes. Mr Jinnah referred to the other suggestions put forward in the memorandum.

Did we say anywhere in that memorandum, "Pakistan here and now"? The Lahore Resolution was passed in March 19.0 and this memorandum was prepared in July 1940. Why was it that we never said anything about Pakistan in the memorandum? . . . .

. . . . Mr Jinnah said that it was due to one and only one reason, namely, we did not wish to embarrass the British Government when they are engaged in this struggle of life and death and their own existence. (Cheers). That is why we said that as soon as the circumstances may permit or soon after the war, the whole problem of India's constitution must be examined *de novo*. (Cheers). Instead of the British Government acknowledging this as an honourable attitude on our part, worthy of their

gratitude, I find that even the British press is playing into the hands of the Congress and Hindu propaganda. (Shame!). I do not know who is responsible for this, whether it is Lord Linlithgow, or whether it is Mr Amery, the Secretary of State for India, or whether it is His Majesty's Government. But let me once more emphasise from this platfrom that the policy of the British Government in India, of inaction, of weakness, and of vacillation, is going to prove more disastrous than it is even in Europe. (Hear, hear). Cannot these men see that events are moving so fast and that maps are being changed? Look at what is happening in Europe. Look at what the Axis Powers are doing —action and action; and what is the British Government doing, placating and placating, vacillation, weakness, inaction!

In this connection, Mr Jinnah referred to the march of events in Yugoslavia and said that, following the German capture of Zagreb, the Yugoslavia province of Croatia had been proclaimed an "independent state", according to the German News Agency, and a Croat general had called on all officials, army officers and non-commissioned officers to take the oath of allegiance to the "New State". They should remember, Mr Jinnah said, that in Yugoslavia there were the Croats, the Slovenes and the Serbs. Their position was very much like our position in India: Dravidastan and the Dravidians, Pakistan and the Muslims and Hindustan and the Hindus. Here is a mighty sub-continent and the question really is: Are you going to wait and allow somebody else to come here and do the job for you or are you going to do it yourselves? . . . .

What are the demands of the Congress? asked Mr Jinnah, and he went on answering the poser by stating that the demand was the declaration of immediate and unconditional independence and freedom of India with power to the people of India, by a constituent assembly, to be elected by adult franchise to frame their own constitution—of course, to the satisfaction of the minorities. (Ironical laughter.) How that will be brought about, Heaven alone knows; I don't know. This was the demand of the Congress, and when they found it was not going to wash—the British Government ought to be grateful to the Muslim League for saving them the maximum amount of trouble the Congress was determined to give them, and he believed that in their heart of hearts the British people were grateful to the Muslim League—they thought of a flanking movement. The Congress found that the British Government would not possibly accept the demand. For the Muslims it meant complete destruction if that demand was conceded. Therefore, naturally the Muslim League opposed it tooth and nail. There were other

minorities also who were concerned with their own status, like the Scheduled Castes, the Christians and so on. The result was that Mr Gandhi and the Congress found, to their unexpected astonishment, a strong opposition to the Congress demand. So the Congress thought that if they could not get what they wanted by a frontal attack, they should try a flanking movement.

What was the flanking movement? Mr Jinnah asked and replied by saying "another resolution". Mr Jinnah here explained that as soon as the Congress passed a resolution, there would be commentators and interpreters. The explanation of the meaning of a resolution would go on for weeks and weeks and by the time the commentators had finished, yards and yards of statements would have been issued. They went from Delhi to Wardha, from Wardha to Delhi, from Delhi to Poona and so on. So when they found that the Muslim League was the power which was holding up their diabolical machinations, they tried the flanking movement at Poona in place of the frontal attack. The change in Poona was only a change in name. The flanking movement was a plan and a strategy which was designed at Poona under the great general, because Mr Jinnah did not believe that Mr Gandhi was not a party to it. (Hear, hear). The Congress, Mr Jinnah said, was willing to throw overboard the general, Mr Gandhi, provided the British Government will do this, namely, make a declaration of immediate independence and freedom of India unconditionally, and the future constitution, the final constitution to be framed after the war; but the provisional constitution should be a national government at the centre, responsible to the legislature. That was the Poona proposal and Mr Gandhi, of course, was thrown overboard. And Mr Kripalani, Secretary of the All-India Congress Committee, said that they went to the length of selling their leader. (Laughter). They sold their leader, and ahinsa (renewed laughter), which was their creed, was also buried in the city of Poona, because the Congress way ready to assits the British in the prosecution of the war and the defence of India. What was "haram" as we say became "halal" at Poona! (Laughter).

Proceeding Mr Jinnah said that the Congress found that this was not going to wash either, because nobody was going to be deceived by this sort of things. They were only deceiving themselves. Then what did they do? All of a sudden, that genius of your province, Mr Rajgopal acharya, came out, as he does such wonderful things at times, with this strategy. He said that "in this national government that we are proposing we are willing that Mr Jinnah should be the Prime Minister, and that he should constitute his cabinet in such manner as he likes". Mr

Jinnah commented that this was done with a view to deceiving the Muslim League which they considered was the only body that was holding up their (Congress) game. Nobody would be deceived by such things. Even a Muslim boy understood these things now . . . .

Mr Jinnah next referred to the Bombay Conference and its proposals. He said that the Hindu Mahasabha had already repudiated and disowned this conference. He thought that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru on his own admission had been a political orphan for a very long time. (Laughter). This political orphan had been caught in a trap, because there was one obsession with him that in the event of supreme danger to India, he alone as the supreme intellect could rescue India. His motives might be good, his intentions might be good. But I am afraid, Mr Jinnah said, the Sapru Conference was like a Dutch army without any privates (laughter), and I think the correct answer of the League was given in that very conference by the clear-headed, experienced Hindu political leader, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad. If Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru had only followed his advice, he would have saved himself. What shall I say to this pose which is now thrust upon him by the wirepullers from behind? The Bombay proposal is nothing but, in another name, the flanking movement and a second edition of the Poona proposal of national government. If they read the memorandum explaining the Bombay resolution, Mr Jinnah said, there could be no doubt left in them . . . .

. . . . . It seems to me that I can only wind up on a note which is really a warning to the British Government, because, after all, they are in possession of this land, and the government of this sub-continent.

Please stop, he declared, please stop your policy of appeasement towards those who are bent upon frustrating the war effort, doing their best to oppose the prosecution of the war and the defence of India at this critical moment. Do you want at this moment to place them in a superior and dominant position now and after the war? Change the corner-stone of the British policy in this country. You are not loyal to those who are willing to stand by you and who sincerely desire to support you. But you desire to placate those who have the greatest nuisance value in political and economic fields. Give up the dominant feature of this policy and the character of this policy. It is that you are trying to get on with those who do not want to get on with you. If you want honestly the support and the cooperation of Muslim India place your cards on the table and take action.

Addressing a word to the delegates, Mr Jinnah said: We

cannot always succeed in settling vital or grave problems, problems affecting life and death, by merely making speeches on this platform or by exposing our opponents and our enemies. The only weapon that you have to forge—and the sooner you forge the better—is to create your own strength, your own power and make your organisation so complete that you can face any danger, any power, any opponent, any enemy singly or combined together . . . .

96

Viceroy's Message regarding Expansion of the Executive Council and Formation of Defence Council conveyed to Quaid-i-Azam through the Governor of Bombay, 20 July, 1941

His Excellency the Viceroy has asked me to let you know his intentions on the matters which follow. I had hoped that I would be able to see you myself in order that I might convey this message to you personally, as was his desire, but unfortunately, now that I am in a position to give you the message, I am not entirely fit, and I am therefore writing to convey it to you by this letter, which I am sending down to Bombay by messenger.

The Viceroy has continued to have very much in mind the whole situation in regard to the war effort and the association of non-official opinion with the prosecution of the war. The obstacles, however, to any settlement on the basis of the complete offer of August last, which emerged so clearly during the discussion last autumn, still exist, to his very great regret, as the last few months, and the reactions to the Secretary of State's statement in the House of Commons on April 22, have made clear. In these circumstances, it is equally clear that he cannot look for that degree of support from the major parties, for the proposals embodied in the August offer, which he desires. Nevertheless, the burden of the conduct of the war on the Central Government has greatly increased, and for administrative reasons it is essential to proceed with some increase in the membership of the Viceroy's Council within the terms of the August offer. The Viceroy, accordingly, is anxious that you should know that he is now, with the approval of his Majesty's Government, creating five new portfolios.

These new portfolios, and the names of the gentlemen by whom they have been accepted, are as follows:

Supply: Sir Homi Mody.

Information: Sir Akbar Hydari

Civil Defence: Mr Raghavendra Rao.

Indians Overseas: Mr Aney.

Labour: Sir Firoz Khan Noon.

The Viceroy would also like you to know that he proposes to fill the vacancies arising in the portfolio of Law when Sir Zafarullah Khan goes to the Federal Court, and in the portfolio of Education when Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai takes up a mission overseas, by the appointment of Sir Sultan Ahmed and Mr Sarkar.

In addition, the Viceroy does not feel that, because of the difficulty in securing the support of the major political parties, it is possible to delay further the more active association of non-official Indian opinion with the prosecution of the war. He is accordingly establishing, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, a National Defence Council. The Council will consist of some thirty members, nine of whom will be drawn from the Indian States. The Viceroy regards it as essential that the great Muslim community should be represented on that Council by persons of the highest prominence and capacity. He has, accordingly, invited the Premiers of Assam, Bengal, the Punjab and Sind to serve as members on it, and he has extended invitations also to certain other prominent Muslims, such as Sir Mohammed Usman. He has considered whether he should invite you to let him have any suggestions as to the possible personnel for this Council, but being aware, as he is, of your general attitude, he has concluded that it would be preferable not to embarrass you by inviting you to make suggestions. . . . .

97

Quaid-i-Azam's Reply to the Governor of Bombay, 21 July, 1941

I am in receipt of your letter of July 20, 1941, which embodies the message of His Excellency the Viceroy. I deeply regret the decision taken by him with the approval of His Majesty's Government. I appreciate when he says that he does not wish to embarrass me by inviting me to make suggestions, knowing, as he does, not only my general attitude but that of the All-India Muslim League. Further, I cannot approve of his having invited the Muslim League Premiers or any other Muslim Leaguer under the scheme of the expansion of the Viceroy's Council as well as what is now called the National Defence Council, because it is obvious that it would embarrass the Muslim League organisation,

and I do hope and trust that His Excellency will avoid such a contingency. Besides, it is hardly fair or proper that they should be approached by His Excellency over the head of the President and the executive of the All-India Muslim League, knowing full well the position and the attitude that the All-India Muslim League has adopted.

It is stated in his message that the Viceroy regards it as essential that the "great Muslim Community should be represented by persons of the highest prominence and capacity". Would it be creditable for any individual prominent or capable Muslim, belonging to an organisation, to accept the invitation contrary to the position and the attitude taken up by that organisation, and would it do any credit to the Government if they succeed in alluring him and create a breach in the organisation, in the hope that he may throw up his allegiance to the party to which he belongs in order to accept the invitation of His Excellency? I maintain that the great Muslim community is represented authoritatively only by the All-India Muslim League organisation. Persistence in the course will not improve matters, but on the contrary it will lead to bitterness on the part of the Muslim League which up to the present moment, fortunately does not exist, however emphatically we have disapproved of the policy which has been pursued by His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy. . . .

98

Resolutions on the Defence Council Issue passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League

After full discussion and consideration the Working Committee are unanimously of opinion that the Hon'ble Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, the Hon'ble Mr Fazlul Haq and the Hon'ble Sir Mohammad Saadullah should resign from the National Defence Council. In view of all the facts placed before the Committee by the President, including the message of His Excellency the Viceroy sent to him through the Governor of Bombay on the 21st of July, 1941, the Hon'ble Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan, the Committee are glad to note, has decided to tender his resignation from the National Defence Council, and the Committee have been informed telephonically that the Hon'ble Sir Mohammed Saadullah has also decided to resign from the National Defence Council. The question, therefore, of disciplinary action against Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan and Sir Mohammed Saadullah does not arise.

The Hon'ble Mr Fazlul Haq has communicated that he would like to have time to consider the matter. If he also resigns from the National Defence Council within ten days and informs the President accordingly no further action will be necessary.

Failing the receipt of a satisfactory reply from Mr Fazlul Haq by the President within the time aforesaid, the Committee hereby fully authorise the President to take such action as he may deem proper and necessary. (Bombay, 24-26 August, 1941).

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League deplore that His Excellency the Viceroy should have gone out of his way to canvass the members of the Muslim League for securing their association with the scheme of expansion of the Executive Council and the constitution of the so-called National Defence Council within the terms of the offer of the 8th of August, 1940, behind the back of the leader of the organisation, knowing full well the express decision of the Council of the League rejecting a scheme on similar lines by its resolution dated the 29th of September, 1940 which was duly communicated to him by the President.

Further the Committee condemn the observations of Mr Amery, the Secretary of State for India, made in the House of Commons in his speech on the Ist of August, 1941, to the effect that he was glad "to think that regardless of party leaders and in defiance of party discipline, patriotic Indians have come forward to work for India's defence", thereby casting a serious reflection on the patriotism of those who do not approve the scheme, and lauding the conduct of those who have been deliberately and by various manoeuvres weaned to commit a breach of party discipline.

The Working Committee are of the considered opinion that the recent decision to resuscitate and impose upon India the scheme of expansion of the Viceroy's Executive Council and the setting up of a National Defence Council was undertaken as a concession to the demands of the Hindus in utter disregard of the wishes of the Muslims of India and the solemn promises made to them and is intended to mislead public opinion in Great Britain and abroad. (Bombay, 24-26 August, 1941).

The Working Committee considered the letter dated the 8th of September, 1941, addressed to the Secretary of the All-India Muslim League by the Hon'ble Mr Fazlul Haq tendering his resignation from the Working Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League, and also the letter of Mr Fazlul Haq addressed to the Secretary dated the 27th of October, 1941, received today in which he says: "I feel that the matter relating

to my letter addressed to you (Secretary of the All-India Muslim League) should be disposed of in my absence. My presence at the discussion may put some members of the League in an awkward position but at any rate I would be put in an awkward position myself if I were to be present at the criticisms that will be made when the letter comes up for discussion. I shall be grateful if you kindly convey to the President my regret that I will not be able to attend the meeting."

The Working Committee consider that the following allegations contained in Mr Fazlul Haq's letter of the 8th of September addressed to the Secretary are untrue and offensive and have cast serious aspersions on the President and the Working Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League and the Muslim leaders of the Provinces where the Mussalmans are in a minority:

"(1) I maintain that this action of the President was unconstitutional in the highest degree.

(2) "The Working Committee endorsed the action of the President, because they had no other alternative before them. If they had refused to ratify the President's action it would have amounted to a vote of no-confidence in the President and this contingency the Working Committee were not prepared to face. It is for this reason that the Working Committee passed the resolution a copy which you have forwarded to me calling upon me to resign unconditionally from the National Defence Council.

(3) "But before I conclude I wish to record a most emphatic protest against the manner in which the interests of the Muslims of Bengal and the Punjab are being imperilled by Muslim leaders of the Provinces where the Muslims are in a minority, popularly known among Muslims as the minority provinces of India.

(4) "As a mark of protest against the arbitrary use of powers vested in its President, I beg to tender my resignation from the membership of the Working Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League. Much as I deplore this course I feel that I cannot usefully continue to be a member of a body which shows scant courtesy to Provincial leaders and which arrogates to itself the functions which ought to be exercised by the provincial executive.

(5) "The President of the All-India Muslim League has signally failed to discharge the heavy responsibilities of his office in a constitutional and reasonable manner.

(6) "In tendering my resignation I should also like to enter the caveat that recent events have forcibly brought home to me that the principles of democracy and autonomy are being subordinated to the arbitrary wishes of a single individual who seeks to rule as an omnipotent authority over the destiny of 33 millions of Muslims in the province of Bengal who occupy the key position in Indian Muslim Politics."

The Working Committee therefore call upon Mr Fazlul Haq to withdraw these allegations and express his regret for having cast these aspersions within ten days from the receipt of the intimation of this resolution.

On the expiry of the time specified above, the Working Committee will decide what action is called for after considering any explanation that Mr Fazlul Haq may offer either in writing or in person and for this purpose, among other matters, instruct the Secretary to inform Mr Fazlul Haq that the Working Committee will meet on the 16th of November, 1941, at the Central Office of the All-India Muslim in Delhi at 11 a.m. (Delhi, 26-27 October, 1941).

The Working Committee considered the following letter of explanation of the Hon'ble Mr Fazlul Haq dated November 14, received by the Honorary Secretary of the All-India Muslim League:
"Dear Nawabzada,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 29 forwarding for my information a copy of resolution No. 2 adopted by the Working Committee of the Muslim League and confirmed by the Council of the Muslim League at meetings of both the bodies held on October 27 at Delhi.

I regret the delay in sending you my reply. It has been due entirely to the poor state of my health, and I did not feel justified in replying to a communication of such serious import without giving the matter most anxious consideration.

No one knows better than the President himself that I have always been a loyal member of the League, have never hesitated to carry out its mandates and once a decision was constitutionally adopted by it, have never hesitated to obey it, even though that decision might not personally commend itself to me. If there were any doubts in regard to this point my resignation from the National Defence Council amply proves it.

It is an irony of fate that of all those who have given of their best to build up the only national organisation of the Muslim India, I should have been the object of so much misunderstanding and so much uniformed criticism. It appears that

portions of my letter have hurt the feelings of the President and some of my other friends. I convey to them through you my assurance that nothing was further from my intention than to hurt the feelings of or to cast aspersions on any one and I hope that my assurance in this respect will be accepted and the matter considered as closed.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) A.K. Fazlul Haq."

The Working Cammittee excuse the delay on the part of Mr Fazlul Haq in not sending the reply within ten days on the ground of his ill-health as the matter as of such serious import that it required his anxious consideration. The Working Committee note Mr Fazlul Haq's earnest reaffirmation of his loyalty to the Muslim League and his statement that he has never hesitated to carry out the mandates of the League the latest instance in proof thereof is his resignation from the National Defence Council in obedience to the decision of the Working Committee. The Working Committee further note his assurance that nothing was further from his intention than to hurt the feelings of or to cast aspersions on the President or the Executive of the League and others concerned; and as Mr Fazlul Haq requests the Working Committee that his assurance should be accepted, it is hereby resolved that no further action be taken in the matter. (Delhi, 16 November, 1941).

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League has noted with great satisfaction the action taken by the President in expelling Mr Falzul Haq from the Muslim League for his treacherous betrayal of the Muslim League organisation and the Mussalmans generally.

The Committee call upon every Muslim Leaguer in the Bengal Legislature to organise the Muslim League and Muslim opinion in the Province to the fullest extent and to join and support the Muslim League Parliamentary Party and not to rest content until the present ministry which is composed of the various elements antagonistic to the cause of Muslim Bengal and of which Mr Fazlul Haq is a more titular Head is over thrown. (Nagpur, 26-27 December, 1941).

98

Resolution on the Sapru Committee's Proposals passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi 22 February, 1942

The Working Committee have carefully considered the proposals formulated by the so-called Non-Party Conference

presided over by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and are definitely of the opinion that if the British Government are misled into accepting them Muslim India will without doubt revolt against any such decision, for these proposals clearly mean the virtual transfer of all power and authority to the Central Government to be set up as indicated in these proposals on the basis of India being a single national unit and enjoying Dominion Status in action, thereby establishing Congress of Hindu Raj for all purposes. Muslim India will never accept such a position which is sought to be secured by Hindu leaders who are virtually hand is glove with the Congress and other allied Hindu organisations in the country under the guise of interim change during the period of the war but in reality the object behind is to coerce of the British Government at this critical moment to surrender and compel them to prejudge and torpedo the Pakistan demand of Muslim India. This will be a clear breach of the pledges given by His Majesty's Government and recently reaffirmed by the Secretary of State for India, Mr Amery, in his speech at Leeds on the 4th of February, 1942 in the following words:

> "That we shall stand by our pledges both by our general pledge as to India's future freedom and also by our pledge to the different main elements in India's national life that they shall not be coerced under a system of Government which they are not prepared to accept."

The Working Committee deplore the method adopted by the Non-Party Conference and its President Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in levelling attack against Mr Amery who as spokesman of His Majesty's Government has refused to resile from the solemn pledges given to the Mussalmans.

The Working Committee trust that the British Government in spite of the present difficult war situation will not submit to coercive methods adopted by Hindu India and shall remain true to their pledges.

100

Extracts from Quaid-i-Azam's Presidential Address at the Twenty-seventh Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League Allahabad, 4 April, 1942

I know that the uppermost subject which is today not only engaging the attention of all India but is also engaging the attention of the whole world, is the mission of Sir Stafford Cripps on behalf of His Majesty's Government. You have been

following it from day to day. Now I want to tell you as far as it is possible for me, and explain to you as shortly as I can this draft declaration of proposals . . . .

The main points that emerge from this document are, first, the object is the creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a dominion associated with the United Kingdom and other dominions by common allegiance to the Crown but equal to them in every respect and in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs. Here there may be some doubts as to the functions and the powers. There are three things—first, status, then comes power and finally functions. But that is a matter which will have to be considered when we come to the signing of a treaty or treaties with one dominion or two dominions or more.

The next point that emerges is this. Immediately upon the cessation of hostilities steps shall be taken to set up in India in the manner described hereafter an elected body charged with the task of framing a new constitution for India. So we shall have an elected body charged with the task of framing a new constitution. I shall deal with it when I come to the clause which lays down that constitution-making body will be set up and how it will be composed.

Third, there is a provision for the fortification of the Indian States.

Fourth, His Majesty's Government undertake to accept and implement forthwith the constitution so framed. But subject to this there are exceptions.

The first exception is the right of any British Indian province that is not prepared to accept the new constitution to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decides. That is to say, the constitution-making body when it completes the framing of the constitution and when that constitution, so framed, emerges from the deliberations of the constitution-making body will be, remember, a sovereign body, then it would be open to any province to say, "We are not in agreement with this constitution, and, therefore, we are not prepared to accede to this constitution". But the most vital point and the most important of all the points, so far as we are concerned particularly, is as to how that province or provinces will express their will and exercise their right. But that is not in the document. But a suggestion has been thrown out by Sir Stafford Cripps and the suggestion is that if a province, in the Legislative Assembly of the province, is in

favour of accession by sixty per cent votes, then it will be an end of it. It means that the province is bound to accede. But if they get fifty-nine per cent votes and the minority happens to be forty-one per cent then there will be a plebiscite of the people of the province. Then, of course, the non-acceding provinces can, among themselves, by the same process, from another Union or a dominion or any single province may stand by itself as a dominion. That is the corollary.

Then comes the provision for treaty—the treaty or treaties which will have to be signed and made with the dominion or dominions that may be set up as well as with the Indian States acceding or not acceding . . . .

. . . . It means, whatever may be the constitutional implications of the status and the powers of the dominion or the dominions that may be set up, the main objective is the creation of a new India Union. We start with that. For that purpose a constitution-making body will be set up which will be the sovereign body. A sovereign body will start—to use the language of Stafford Cripps—with a preference for an All-India Union.

Think what will be the composition of that body. The composition of that body would be that first of all it will be elected from amongst the members of the eleven Assemblies meeting together as one college and by means of proportional representation, not separate electorates. When that body is formed I cannot conceive how they can come to any other conclusion except the Union; and that is why it is so composed.

But after the constitution-making body has framed its constitution by a bare majority, it is true that any single province or provinces who do not approve of that constitution are given a chance to go through another test which I shall explain hereafter. But remember that, at the most, Mussalmans even by separate electorates will not be more than 25 per cent; but by the system of proportional representation they might be less in number in the constitution-making body. So the overwhelming majority will be non-Muslim and, therefore, the probabilities are contemplated that the constitution may by a majority be in favour of only one Union.

The other point which is not there is: Will the decision of this constitution-making body be taken by a bare majority or not? Reading that document, as I do, clearly it cannot be anything else, because it is the accepted rule of every document that when we want to lay down a specific majority we state so. If you do state not so, then it means the rule of a bare majority.

For instance, in our own constitution we have the clause that our constitution cannot be changed except by a majority of two-thirds. So that is the constitution-making body. If I may make a comment on this a little, Mr Gandhi will come to this constitution-making body with a dead certainty of getting a constitution which will emerge for an All-India Union.

Now when that is done, the province or provinces who would feel unhappy are given the constitution—"No, no, you have yet another chance before you are killed". (Laughter). And what is that chance? The chance is that—and it is not in the document but a suggestion of Sir Stafford Cripps—of course, various, suggestions have been made; we shall also make our suggestions when the time comes; but at present he has made a suggestion. He says, "look here, if forty-one per cent are against it then a plebiscite". Whose plebiscite? Of course, the plebiscite of the province.

Whose self-determination do you want to ascertain? Self-determination of the two nations put together or one nation alone? (Hear, hear). The answer is, of course, of both together.

That is another chance, and if you get the plebiscite in your favour then, at least, you will escape the slaughter-house before our *qurbani* is made. (Laughter). This is the point of a most vital character so far as Muslim India is concerned.

Then with regard to the present, gentlement, I can tell you nothing except what is contained in this document, because it entirely depends on as to what will be the final picture and I cannot throw any light on it. I have explained to you, and I hope correctly, and if I am not correct I shall certainly stand corrected by Sir Stafford Cripps or anybody else. After explaining the draft declaration of the proposals I think I am echoing your feelings when I say that the Mussalmans feel deeply disappointed that the entity and integrity of the Muslim nation has not been expressly recognised. (Hear, hear).

Any attempt to solve the problem of India by the process of evading the real issues and by over-emphasising the territorial entity of the provinces which are mere accidents of British policy and administrative divisions is fundamentally wrong. (Hear, hear). Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the right of national self-determination is unequivocally recognised. (Hear, hear).

It must be realised that India was never a country or a nation. India's problem is international in this sub-continent and

differences—cultural, social, political and economic—are so fundamental that they cannot be covered up, concealed or confused but must be handled by all as realists.

The alleged power of the minority in the matter of secession suggested in the document is illusory, as Hindu India will dominate the decision in favour of one All-India Union in all the provinces and the Muslims in Bengal and the Punjab will be at the mercy of the Hindu minority in those provinces who will exert themselves to the fullest extent and length for keeping the Mussalmans tied to the chariot wheel of Hindudom. Thus the Mussalmans will be doomed to subjection in all the provinces. (Hear, hear).

We cannot barter away with our consent the future for the present while fully realising the danger of foreign aggression and notwithstanding all our anxieties to defend India and to help the prosecution of war. To do so will be a crime on our part to posterity and generations of hundreds of millions of Muslims to come. (Hear, hear.)

As regards the proposals relating to the immediate adjustments in the central and provincial governments which we are told must be considered within the framework of the existing constitution, it is difficult to gather from the document anything definite and concrete, for it must necessarily depend upon the full picture when it is disclosed and it is not known to us, nor is it before us yet. The document is a bare skeleton of the proposals and obviously requires a lot of filling in and adjusting before it can be made acceptable and it is one of those cases where the details will become more vital than the bare statement of certain principles.

It has roused our deepest anxieties and grave apprehensions, specially with reference to the Pakistan scheme which is a matter of life and death for Muslim India (Hear, hear). We will, therefore, endeavour that the principle of Pakistan which finds only veiled recognition in the document, should be conceded in unequivocal terms and until we know how the right of Mussalmans to keep out or accede thereto is defined to our satisfaction, we do not wish to see that the history of Palestine should be repeated as it was after the last war (hear, hear) after we have paid for the promises in blood, money and material.

The document shows that Pakistan is treated as a remote possibility and there is a definite preference for a new Indian Union which is the main objective and suggestion and the rules of procedure and the process indicated in the document and the

interviews and explanations of Sir Stafford Cripps so far are against us and we are called upon to play the game with loaded dice. . . .

101

Resolution on the Draft Declaration brought by Sir Stafford Cripps passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 11 April, 1942

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have given their most earnest and careful consideration to the announcement made by Mr Churchill, the British Prime Minister, in the House of Commons on the 11th of March, 1942 and the Draft Declaration of the War Cabinet of His Majesty's Government regarding the future of India and also the interim proposals, during the critical period which now faces India, for the immediate participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the counsels of their country.

The Committee appreciate that the British Prime Minister, in his pronouncement, made it clear that the Draft Declaration embodied only the proposals of His Majesty's Government and not their decision, and that they are subject to agreement between the main elements in India, thus maintaining the validity of the declaration of the 8th of August, 1940, which had promised to the Mussalmans that neither the machinery for the framing of the constitution should be set up nor the constitution itself should be enforced without the approval and consent of Muslim India.

The Working Committee, while expressing their gratification that the possibility of Pakistan is recognised by implication by providing for the establishment of two or more independent Unions in India, regret that the proposals of His Majesty's Government, embodying the fundamentals, are not open to any modification and therefore no alternative proposals are invited. In view of the rigidity of the attitude of His Majesty's Government with regard to the fundamentals not being open to any modification, the Committee have no alternative but to say that the proposals in their present form are unacceptable to them for reasons given below:

(1) The Mussalmans, after twenty-five years of genuine efforts for the reconciliation of two major communities and the bitter experience of the failure of such efforts, are convinced that

it is neither just nor possible, in the interest of peace and happiness of the two peoples, to compel them to constitute one Indian Union, composed of the two principal nations—Hindus and Muslims—which appears to be the main object of His Majesty's Government, as adumbrated in the preamble of the Draft Declaration, the creation of more than one Union being relegated only to the realm of remote possibility and is purely illusory.

(2) In the Draft Declaration a constitution-making body has been proposed with the primary object of creating one Indian Union. So far as the Muslim League is concerned, it has finally decided that the only solution of India's constitutional problem is the partition of India into independent zones, and it will, therefore, be unfair to the Mussalmans to compel them to enter such a constitution-making body, whose main object is the creation of a new Indian Union. With conditions as they are, it will be not only futile but on the contrary may exacerbate bitterness and animosity amongst the various elements in the country.

Besides, the machinery which has been proposed for the creation of the constitution-making body, namely, that it will consist of members elected by the newly elected Lower Houses of the eleven provinces, upon the cessation of hostilities, as a single Electoral College by the system of proportional representation, is a fundamental departure from the right of the Mussalmans hitherto enjoyed by them, to elect their representatives by means of separate electorates, which is the only sure way in which true representatives of the Mussalmans can be chosen.

The constitution-making body will take decisions by a bare majority on all questions of most vital and paramount character involved in the framing of the constitution, which is a departure from the fundamental principles of justice and contrary to constitutional practice so far followed in the various countries and Dominions; and the Mussalmans, by agreeing to this will, instead of exercising their right and judgment as a constituent factor, be at the entire mercy of the constitution making body, in which they will be a minority of about twenty-five per cent.

(3) The right of non-accession to the Union, as contemplated in the Draft Declaration, has been conceded, presumably, in response to the insistent demands by the Mussalmans for the partition of India, but the method and procedure laid down are such as to negative the professed object, for, in the Draft

proposals, the right of non-accession has been given to the existing provinces, which have been formed from time to time for administrative convenience and on no logical basis.

The Mussalmans cannot be satisfied by such a declaration on a vital question affecting their future destiny and demand a clear and precise pronouncement on the subject. Any attempt to solve the future problem of India by the process of evading the real issues is to court disaster.

In the Draft Proposals no procedure has been laid down as to how the verdict of the province is to be obtained in favour of or against accession to the one Union; but in the letter dated the 2nd of April from the Secretary of Sir Stafford Cripps, addressed to the President of the All-India Muslim League, it is stated that "a province should reach the decision whether or not to stand out of the Union by a vote in the Legislative Assembly on a resolution to stand in. If the majority for accession to the Union is less than sixty per cent, the minority will have the right to demand a plebiscite of the adult male population". In this connection it must be emphasised that in the provinces where the Mussalmans are in a majority, as in the case of the major provinces of Bengal and the Punjab, they are in a minority in the Legislative Assemblies; and in the Assemblies of Sind and the North-West Frontier Province, the total number, namely, sixty and fifty respectively, is so small and the weightage given to the non-Muslims so heavy that it can be easily manipulated and a decision under such conditions cannot be the true criterion of ascertaining the real opinion of the Mussalmans of those provinces.

As regards the suggested plebiscite in the provinces in which the Mussalmans are in a majority, in the event of the requisite majority not being available in the Legislative Assemblies, the procedure laid down is that reference shall be made to the whole adult population of the provinces and not to the Mussalmans alone, which is to deny them the inherent right to self-determination.

(4) With regard to the Indian States, it is the considered opinion of the Committee that it is a matter for them to decide whether to join or not to join or form a Union.

(5) With regard to the treaties to be negotiated between the Crown and the Indian Union or Unions, the proposals do not indicate as to what would happen in case of disagreement on the terms between the contracting parties, nor is there any provision made as to what would be the procedure when there

is a difference of opinion in negotiating a revision of treaty arrangements with the Indian States in the new situation.

(6) With regard to the interim arrangement, there is no definite proposal except the bare statement that His Majesty's Government desire and invite the effective and immediate participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the counsels of their conctry, of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations. The Committee are, therefore, unable to express their opinion until a complete picture is available. Another reason why the Committee are unable to express their opinion on the interim arrangements for participation in the counsels of the country is that Sir Stafford Cripps has made it clear that the scheme goes through as a whole or is rejected as a whole and that it would not be possible to retain only the part relating to the immediate arrangements at the centre and discard the rest of the Draft Scheme, and as the Committee has come to the conclusion that the proposals for the future are unacceptable, it will serve no useful purpose to deal further with the question of the immediate arragements.

In conclusion the Committee wish to point out that the position of the Muslim League has been and is that unless the principle of Pakistan scheme, as embodied in the Lahore resolution dated March 1940, which is now the creed of the All-India Muslim League, namely,—

"The establishment of completely Independent States formed by demarcating geographically contiguous units into regions which shall be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Mussalmans are numerically in a majority, as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India, shall be grouped together to constitute Independent States as Muslim Free National Homelands in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign;

"That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in the above-mentioned units and regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them;

"That in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation wtih them;"

is unequivocally accepted and the right of the Mussalmans to self-determination is conceded by means of a machinery which will reflect the true verdict of Muslim India, it is not possible for the Muslim League to accept any proposal or scheme regarding the future.

102

Resolution on the "Quit India" Movement of the Congress passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 16-20 August, 1942

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, having given their deep and anxious consideration to the present political development in the country, deplore the decision arrived at by the All-India Congress Committee on August 8, 1942, to launch an "open rebellion" by resorting to the mass civil disobedience movement in pursuance of their objective of establishing Congress Hindu domination in India which has resulted in lawlessness and considerable destruction of life and property.

It is the considered opinion of the Working Committee that this movement is directed not only to coerce the British Government into handing over power to a Hindu oligarchy and thus disabling them from carrying out their moral obligations and pledges given to the Mussalmans and other sections of the people of India from time to time but also to force the Mussalmans to submit and surrender to Congress terms and dictation. Ever since the beginning of the war and even prior to that the sole objective of Congress policy has been either to cajole or to coerce the British Government into surrendering power to the Congress —a Hindu body with a microscopic following of other communities—in utter suppression of one hundred millions of Mussalmans, besides millions of other peoples of this vast sub-continent of India. While claiming the right of self-determination for "India", which is a mere Congress euphemism for a Hindu majority, it has persistently opposed the right of self-determination for the Muslim nation to decide and determine their own destiny.

On May 1, 1942, the All-India Congress Committee by their resolution emphatically repudiated the Muslim League demand for the right of self-determination for Muslims and thus closed the door for the settlement of the communal problem, which is a condition precedent to the attainment of the freedom and independence of India. The Congress had also recognized this as

an indispensable condition and had, therefore, made it a prominent plank in the Congress programme for over 20 years, but by their recent decisions have suddenly thrown it overboard and substituted the fantastic theory that the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem can only follow the withdrawal of British power from India.

The negotations of Sir Stafford Cripps with the Congress broke down not on the issue of independence but because of the refusal of the British Government to hand over the Muslims and the minorities to the tender mercies of the Congress. Any acquiescence in this on the part of the British would have been strenuously resisted by the minorities and particularly by the Muslim nation, with memories of tyranny in the Congress governed provinces still fresh and vivid in their minds.

Baulked in their effort to cajole Sir Stafford Cripps to agree to the transfer of power to the Congress caucus, they decided upon a slogan "Quit India"—accompanied by the threat of mass civil disobedience. This slogan is a mere camouflage and what is really aimed at is supreme control of the government of the country by the Congress.

The Muslims are not a whit less insistent on freedom for the country and the achievement of independence of the people of India, which is the creed of the All-India Muslim League. They are, however, firmly convinced that the present Congress movement is not directed for securing the independence of all the constituent elements in the life of the country but for the establishment of a Hindu Raj and to deal a death-blow to the Muslim goal of Pakistan.

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League note with dissatisfaction the attitude and policy of the British Government towards the national aspirations of 100 millions of Muslims of India. While the Congress aims at ignoring and suppressing the Muslim demand, the Working Committee regret that the British Government have been unresponsive to the Muslim League offer of cooperation. The appeasement of the Congress has been the central pivot of the Government's policy with barren and sterile results and has now culminated in open defiance of law and order.

Since the commencement of hostilities the Muslim League has been ready and willing, either singly or in cooperation with other parties, to shoulder the responsibility for running the administration and mobilizing the resources of the country for the war effort and for the defence of India if a real share in the

power and authority of the Government at the Centre and in the provinces is conceded within the framework of the present constitution, and in pursuance of this policy the Muslim League accepted the underlying principles of the August offer of 1940 of the British Government.

But the Government, in implementing the offer, nullified the essential principles of it and so made it impossible for the Muslim League to cooperate with the Government on honourable terms. In spite of the fact that the British Government had spurned the offer of cooperation of the Muslim League, under the imminent shadow of the Japanese menace the Muslim League, once again reiterated their offer by their resolution of December 27, 1941 in the following words:

"In view of the fact that the entry of Japan in the war on the side of Axis powers has brought the danger much closer to India and has forced into greater prominence the question of the defence of India, the Working Committee consider it necessary to reiterate that the Muslim League from the very beginning has expressed its willingness to share the responsibility of defence of the country as is evident from the stand taken by the President of the All-India Muslim League as far back as November, 1939.

"The Working Committee once more declare that they are ready and willing as before to shoulder the burden of defence of the country, singly or in co-operation with other parties, on the basis that a real share and responsibility is given in the authority of the Government at the Centre and provinces within the framework of the present constitution, but without prejudice to the major political issues involved in the framing of the future constitution."

The British Government completely ignored the offer of the Muslim League. While the proposals of Sir Stafford Cripps virtually conceded the Congress demands of the right of secession from the British Commonwealth of Nations and forming of a Constiuent Assembly with a preponderantly Hindu majority for the framing of the post-war constitution, they merely recognised the possibility of establishing Pakistan supposed to be implicit in the non-accession scheme.

The Working Committee are definitely of the opinion that if the Muslim masses are to be roused to Intensify the war efforts with all the sacrifices that are involved it is only possible provided they are assured that it would lead to the realization of the goal of Pakistan. The Muslim League, therefore, calls

upon the British Government to come forward without further delay with an unequivocal declaration guaranteeing to the Muslims the right of self-determination and to pledge themselves that they will abide by the verdict of a plebiscite of Mussalmans and give effect to the Pakistan scheme in consonance with the basic principles laid down by the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League passed in March 1940.

Having regard to the oft-repeated declaration of the United Nations to secure and guarantee the freedom and independence of the smaller nations of the world, the Working Comittee invite the immediate attention of the United Nations to the demand of 100 millions of Muslims of India to establish sovereign States in the zones which are their homelands and where they are in a majority.

The Working Committee are fully convinced that Pakistan is the only solution of India's constitutional problem and is in complete consonance with justice and fairplay to the two great nations—Muslims and Hindus—inhabiting this vast sub-continent; whereas if the Congress demand is accepted it would bring the 100 millions of Muslims under the yoke of a Hindu Raj which must inevitably result either in anarchy and chaos or complete strangulation and annihilation of Muslim India and all that Islam stands for. The Muslim League, as it has been repeatedly made clear, stands not only for Pakistan and the freedom of Muslims but also for the freedom and independence of Hindustan and Hindus.

The Muslim League, has been and is ready and willing to consider any proposals and negotiate with any party on a footing of equality for the setting up of a provisional Government of India in order to mobilize the resources of the country for the purpose of the defence of India and successful prosecution of the war, provided the demands of Muslim India, as indicated above, are conceded unequivocally.

In these circumstances the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, after anxious and careful consideration, call upon the Muslims to abstain from any participation in the movement initiated by the Congress and to continue to pursue their normal peaceful life. The Working Committee hope that no attempt shall be made from any quarter to intimidate, coerce, molest or interfere in any manner with the normal life of the Muslims, otherwise the Muslims will be compelled to offer resistance and adopt all such measures as may be necessary for the protection of their life, honour and property.

103

Resolution on Palestine passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 9 November, 1942

This meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League views with great concern the British attitude under the influence of Jewish machination in still not granting independence to the Arabs of Palestine which Britain had pledged at the time of its great need and distress, during the course of the last great war.

This Council of the All-India Muslim League regrets that in spite of the British Declaration of fighting for justice and right of all nations to be independent, which they claim as one of their war aims, it is trying to force the Jewish domination over the Arabs against their will, in direct violation of the pledges made in the last war, and the principle it claims to fight for during the present war. This leads to doubt and suspect the *bona fides* of the United Nations as to their war aims.

Further, this meething of the Council of the All-India Muslim League in accordance with it's policy to stand by its Muslim brothers, hereby calls upon the British Government to honour their pledges and do justice to the Arabs of Palestine. This meeting also assures its Arab brethren in Palestine, that Mulism India will stand by them in their fight for their rights against the domination of international Jewry.

104

Resolution on British Government's Attitude vis-a-vis Pakistan passed at the Thirtieth Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 24-26 April, 1943

This session of the All-India Muslim League views with concern and grave apprehension the failure of the British Government to make an explicit declaration asked for in the resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, in Bombay on the 10th of August 1942, which *inter alia* says:

"The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League note with dissatisfaction the attitude and policy of the British Government towards the national aspirations of 100 millions of Muslims of India. While the Congress aims at ignoring and

suppressing the Muslim demand, the Working Committee regret that the British Government have been unresponsive to the Muslim League offer of cooperation. The appeasement of the Congress has been the central pivot of the Government's policy with barren and sterile results and has now culminated in open defiance of law and order. Since the commencement of hostilities the Muslim League has been ready and willing either singly or in cooperation with other parties, to shoulder the responsibility of running the administration and mobilizing the resources of the country for the war effort and for the defence of India if a real share in the power and authority of the Government at the Centre and in the provinces is conceded within the framework of the present constitution, and in pursuance of this policy the Muslim League accepted the underlying principles of the August offer of 1940 of the British Government."

"But the Government, in implementing the offer, nullified the essential principles of it and so made it impossible for the Muslim League to cooperate with the Government on honourable terms. In spite of the fact that the British Government had spurned the offer of cooperation of the Muslim League, under the imminent shadow of the Japanese menace the Muslim League once again reiterated their offer by their resolution of December 27, 1941, in the following words:

"In view of the fact that the entry of Japan in the war on the side of Axis powers has brought the danger much closer to India and has forced into greater prominence the question of the defence of India, the Working Committee consider it necessary to reiterate that the Muslim League from the very beginning has expressed its willingness to share the responsibility of defence of the country as is evident from the stand taken by the President of the All-India Muslim League as far back as November, 1939.

"The Working Committee once more declare that they are ready and willing as before to shoulder the burden of defence of the country singly or in cooperation with other parties; on the basis that a real share and responsibility is given in the authority of the Government at the Centre and the provinces within the framework of the present constitution, but without prejudice to the major political issues involved in the framing of the future constitution.

"The British Government completely ignored the offer of the Muslim League. While the proposals of Sir Stafford Cripps virtually conceded the Congress demands of the right of secession

from the British Commonwealth of Nations and forming of a constituent Assembly with a preponderantly Hindu majority for the framing of the post-war constitution, they merely recognised the possibility of establishing Pakistan supposed to be implicit in the non-accession scheme.

"The Working Committee are definitely of the opinion that if the Muslim masses are to be roused to intensify war effort with all the sacrifices that are involved it is only possible provided they are assured that it will lead to the realization of the goal of Pakistan. The Muslim League, therefore, calls upon the British Government to come forward without further delay with an unequivocal declaration guaranteeing to the Muslims the right of self-determination and to pledge themselves that they will abide by the verdict of a plebiscite of Mussalmans and give effect to the Pakistan scheme in consonance with the basis principles laid down by the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League passed in March 1940.

"Having regard to the oft-repeated declaration of the United Nations to secure and guarantee the freedom and independence of the smaller nations of the world, the Working world Committee invite the immediate attention of the United Nations to the demand of 100 millions of Muslims of India to establish sovereign states in the zones which are their homelands and where they are in a majority.

"The Working Committee are fully convinced that Pakistan is the only solution of India's constitutional problem and is in complete consonance with justice and fairplay to the two great nations--Muslims and Hindus--inhabiting this vast sub-continent; whereas if the Congress demand is accepted it would bring the 100 millions of Muslims under the yoke of a Hindu Raj which must inevitably result either in anarchy and chaos or complete strangulation and annihilation of Muslim India and all that Islam stands for. The Muslim League. as it has been repeatedly made clear, stands not only for Pakistan and the freedom of Muslims but also for the freedom and independence of Hindustan and Hindus."

The Muslim League, has been and is ready and willing to consider any proposals and negotiate with any party on a footing of equality for the setting up of a provisional Government of India in order to mobilize the resources of the country for the purpose of the defence of India and successful prosecution of the war, provided the demands of Muslim India, as indicated above, are conceded unequivocally. Since that resolution was passed, the speeches and statements made by responsible British statemen, both, in England and in India, lead to the conviction that not

only the declaration such as was asked for, will not be forthcoming, but that some kind of Federal Constitution, not necessarily on the model embodied in the Act of 1935, is under contemplation. This Session, therefore, warns the British Government in all earnestness that the imposition of such a Federal Constitution will be resisted by Muslim India with all its might, which will inevitably result in strife, bloodshed and misery, the responsibility of which will rest on the British Government alone.

That this Session of the All-India Muslim League is convinced that the attainment of the cherished goal of Pakistan is only possible by the untiring effort, willing sacrifices and grim determination of the Muslims and they should, therefore, do their utmost to acquire the strength requisite for such an undertaking.

104

Resolution on Palestine passed at the same Session

This Session of the All-India Muslim League views with great concern and alarm the new Zionist propaganda and move in U.S.A. which is putting pressure on U.S.A. Government for exercising its influence with the British Government firstly to remove all present restrictions on Jewish Immigration in Palestine and secondly to adopt the policy of converting Palestine into a Jewish State.

In the opinion of this session the aim of this new Zionist move is to make Jewish majority in Palestine a fait accompli by opening her doors to the Jewish war refugees on the ground of war emergency and persecution of Jews in Europe.

This Session condemns this new move as a deliberate attempt to perpetrate a wrong on Arab and Islamic world at a time when the Arab National Higher Committee of Palestine stands disbanded and the Arab nationalists are at present almost defenceless against organized Jewry and High Finance in the world.

This Session reiterating its demands for the fulfilment of Arab national demands for Arab independence in Palestine and Syria solemnly warns the British Government against any step or move which may prove detrimental to Arab national interests and declares that such a policy will be bitterly resented by the whole Arab and Islamic world as an outrage on democracy and justice and inalienable Arab rights to their homelands.

105

Resolution on Committee of Action passed at the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, Karachi 24-26 December, 1943

Whereas the All-India Muslim League in its annual session held at Delhi in April 1943 had, in view of the vague, indefinite and unsettled policy of the British Government towards the Muslim demand for Pakistan on the one hand and the unpatriotic, short-sighted and antagonistic attitude of the Hindus on the other, resolved to rely on the untiring effort, grim determination and willing sacrifices of the Muslims of India generally and the Muslims of Pakistan zones in particular for the attainment of their cherished goal, this session of the All-India Muslim League hereby resolves to appoint a Committee of Action of not less than five and not more than seven members, to be nominated by the President, to prepare and organize the Muslims all over India to meet all contingencies, resist the imposition of an All-India Federation or any other constitution for one United India, and prepare them for the coming struggle for the achievement of Pakistan.

106

Resolution on Planning Committee passed at the same Session

Whereas, as the first step towards consolidating the strength of the Muslims in Pakistan areas and preparing them for the heavy and onerous responsibilities inherent in the status of an Independent Sovereign State, the All-India Muslim League has, with the support and cooperation of the Muslims succeeded in establishing its Governments in all the Pakistan Provinces, which has naturally opened up vast opportunities to the Muslim representatives in the Assemblies and Cabinets for service to their people in the Provincial sphere of activities like education, agriculture, irrigation, providing with facilities for labour, economic holdings and fair rent for tenants, etc., and whereas it is acutely realized that neither the people nor the Provincial States, which have for long been denied opportunities for a fair and natural development due to historical, political and, in some instances, communal considerations, will be able to ameliorate their lot to any appreciable

degree or effectively function as a State without a gigantic and coordinated drive in the field of economic reconstruction and state industrialisation, this Session of the All-India Muslim League hereby authorises the President to appoint a Committee, with power to coopt, to prepare a comprehensive scheme for five-year programme for the economic and social uplift, state Industrialisation in Pakistan Zones, introduction of free primary basic education, reform of land system, stablisation of rent, security of tenure, improvement in the condition of labour and agriculture and control of money lending. The Committee shall submit its report as early as possible and an interim report not later than June 1944 to the Working Committee for necessary action thereon.

107

Resolution on Committee of Action passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Karachi, 27 December, 1943

In pursuance of Resolution No; 1, passed by the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League held at Karachi from the 24th to 26th December, 1943, the President appointed the following committee for one year to immediataly undertake the work of organizing, coordinating and unifying the various branches of the League under the entire Muslim League Organization in consonance with the constitution and rules and the policy and programme of the All-India Muslim League:

Nawab Mohammed Ismail Khan Sahib (Chairman);

Mr G.M. Syed;

Haji Abdul Sattar Ishaq Seth;

Nawab Iftikhar Husain Khan Sahib of Mamdot;

Qazi Mohammad Isa Sahib;

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan Sahib, (Convener).

The Working Committee with a view to facilitate the work of the Committee appointed by the President, hereby resolves to delegate the following powers to it:

(1) to appoint or institute Sub-Committees for carrying out such duties and functions as may be entrusted to them;

(2) to control, direct and regulate all the activities of the various Provincial Leagues strictly in consonance with the aims,

objects and rules of the All-India Muslim League;

(3) to take disciplinary action against any member of the All-India Muslim League who violates the decisions of the League or acts in contravention of its aims and objects, subject to a right of appeal to the Council of the All-India Muslim League;

(4) to suspend, dissolve or disaffiliate any Provincial League which fails in its duties, infringes or ignores the decisions or directions of the Working Committee or the Council of the All-India Muslim League or hinders the progress of the League in any manner whatsoever, subject to a right of appeal to the Council of the All-India Muslim League;

(5) to take disciplinary action against any office-bearer of a Provincial League who fails in his duties, ignores the decisions or directions of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League or hinders the progress of the League in any manner whatsoever, subject to a right of appeal to the Council of the All-India Muslim League.

In view of the appointment of the above-mentioned Committee it is not necessary to constitute a separate All-India Civil Defence Committee as its functions will also be exercised by this Committee.

108

Jinnah-Gandhi Correspondence, Bombay, 10-26 Spetember, 1944

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 10

Dear Mr Gandhi,

With reference to our talk yesterday, September 9th, I understood from you that you had come to discuss the Hindu-Muslim settlement with me in your individual capacity and not in any representative character or capacity on behalf of th: Hindus or the Congress nor had you any authority to do so. I naturally pointed out to you that there must be some one on the other side with authority holding a representative status with whom I can negotiate and, if possible, come to a stettlement of the Hindu-Muslim question, and that for the position you had adopted there was no precedent, and that this raises great difficulties in my way.

As you know, I can only speak on behalf of Muslim India

and the All-India Muslim League, as the President of the organization which I represent and as such I am subject to and governed by its constitution, rules and regulations. I think you realize and will admit that the settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question is the foremost and the major hurdle and unless representatives of these two nations put their heads together, how is one to make any headway with it?

Nevertheless, I explained to you the Lahore resolution of March 1940 and tried to persuade you to accept the basic and fundamental principles embodied in it, but you not only refused to consider it but emphasized your opposition to the basis indicated in that resolution and remarked that there was "an ocean between you and me". When I asked you what was then the alternative you suggested, you put forward the formula of Mr Rajgopalacharia approved by you. We discussed it, and as various matters were vague and nebulous, and some required clarification, I wanted to have a clear idea of what it really meant and what were its implications, and asked you for explanation and clarification regarding the proposals embodied in that formula.

After some discussion, you requested me to formulate in writing my points that I thought required, or called for, an explanation and clarification and to communicate with you and that you would reply in writing before our next meeting on Monday, September 11, at 5.30 p.m. I am, therefore, submitting to you the following points which require clarification:

(1) With regard to the preamble. In what capacity will you be a consenting party if any agreement is reached between you and me?

(2) *Clause 1.* With regard to "the constitution for a free India" referred to in this clause, I should like to know first—what constitution do you refer to, who will frame it and when will it come into being?

Next, it is stated in the formula that "the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for independence". Does it mean the Congress demand for independence as formulated in the August Resolution of 1942 by the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay or, if not, what is the significance of this term, for you know the Muslim League has made it clear not only by its resolutions but by its creed, which is embodied in its constitution, that we stand for the freedom and independence of the whole of this sub-continent and that applies to Pakistan and Hindustan,

Next, it is stated that the Muslim League "will cooperate with the Congress in its formation of a provisional interim Government for the transitional period". I should like to know the basis or the lines on which such a Government is to be set up or constituted. If you have a complete and definite scheme, please let me have it.

(3) *Clause 2.* Who will appoint the commission referred to in this clause and who will give effect to their findings? What is the meaning of absolute majority referred to in it? Will the contemplated plebiscite be taken districtwise or, if not, on what basis? Who will determine and decide whether such a plebiscite should be based on adult franchise or other practicable franchise? Who will give effect to the decision or verdict of the abovementioned plebiscite? Would only the districts on the border, which are taken out from the boundaries of the present province by delimitation, be entitled to choose to join either state, or would also those outside the present boundaries have the right to choose to join either state?

(4) *Clause 3.* Who are meant by "all parties" in this clause?

(5) *Clause 4.* I should like to know between whom and through what machinery any agency will the "mutual agreements" referred to in this clause be entered into? What is meant by "safeguarding defence and commerce, communications and for other essential purposes?" Safeguarding against whom?

(6) *Clause 5.* "These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the Government of India". I should like to know to whom is this power to be transferred, through what machinery and agency and when?

These are some of the important points that occur to me for the moment, which require explanation and clarification, and I hope that you will let me have full details about the various points that I have raised in order that I may be better able to understand and judge your proposals before I can deal with them satisfactorily.

Yours sincerely.
M.A. Jinnah

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 11

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

I received your letter yesterday at 3.30 p.m. I was in the

midst of appointments. I hasten to reply at the earliest opportunity.

I have said in my letter to you, it is implied in the Rajaji formula and I have stated publicly that I have approached you as an individual. My life mission has been Hindu-Muslim unity which I want for its own sake but which is not to be achieved without the foreign ruling power being ousted.

Hence the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving independence by the joint action of all parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too, I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together.

I am glad, therefore, that you did not break off our talks when I refused to assume or accept representative capacity. Of course, I am pledged to use all the influence I may have with the Congress to ratify my agreement with you. May I remind you that the Rajaji formula was designed in the first instance for your acceptance and submission thereafter to the League?

It is true that I said an ocean separated you and me in outlook. But that had no reference to the Lahore resolution of the League. The Lahore resolution is indefinite. Rajaji has taken from it the substance and given it a shape.

Now for the points raised by you.

1. I have already answered this in the foregoing.

2. The constitution will be framed by the provisional government contemplated in the formula or an authority specially set up by it after the British power is withdrawn. The independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands.

The basis for the formation of the provisional interim gouernment will have to be agreed to between the League and the Congress.

3. The commission will be appointed by the provisional government. Absolute majority means a clear majority over non-Muslim elements as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province. The form of plebiscite and the franchise must be a matter for discussion.

4. "All parties" means parties interested.

5. "Mutual agreement" means agreement between contracting parties. "Safeguarding, defence, etc." means for me a central or joint board of control. Safeguarding means safeguarding against all who may put the common interests in jeopardy.

6. The power is to be transferred to the nation, that is to the provisional government. The formula contemplates peaceful transfer by the British Government. So far as I am concerned, I should like the transfer to take place as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,

M.A. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 11

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I received your letter of September 11 at 5 p.m. today. I note that you have approached me as an individual and I have already expressed my views about it. Please do not take it that I acquiesce in the position that you have adopted for which there is no precedent. Nevertheless I proceeded to discuss matters with you because naturally, I am anxious to convert you to my point of view if possible. I urged you that the only solution of India's problem is to accept the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan, as briefly laid down in the Lahore resolution of March 1940 and proceed to settle details forthwith.

You say the Lahore resolution is indefinite. You never asked me for any clarification or explanation of the terms of the resolution, but you really indicated your emphatic opposition to the very basis and the fundamental principles embodied in it. I should, therefore, like to know in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is indefinite. I cannot agree that Rajaji has taken from its substance and given it shape. On the contrary, he has not only put it out of shape but mutilated it, as I explained in my speech which I delivered at the meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League at Lahore on July 30.

You say the "first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving independence by the joint action of all parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together."

This, in my opinion, is, as I have repeatedly said, putting the cart before the horse, and is generally opposed to the policy and declarations of the All-India Muslim League. You are only holding on firmly to the August Resolution of 1942.

In order to achieve the freedom and independence of the peoples of India it is essential, in the first instance, that there should be a Hindu-Muslim settlement. Of course, I am thankful to you when you say that you are pledged to use all the influence that

you have with the Congress to ratify your agreement with me, but that it is not enough in my judgment, although it will be a very valuable help to me. I once more ask you please to let me know what is your conception or basis for the formation of a provisional interim government. No doubt, it will be subject to agreement between the League and the Congress, but I think in fairness you should at least give me some rough idea or lines of your conception, for you must have thought it out by now and I would like to know what are your proposals or scheme for the formation of a provisional interim government, which can give me some clear picture to understand it.

You have omitted to answer my question as to who will give effect to the findings of the commission, and also it is not clear to me what you mean by absolute majority, when you say it means "a clear majority over non-Muslim elements as in Sind, Baluchistan or in the Frontier Province." You have not even replied to my question as to who wil decide the form of the plebiscite and the franchise contemplated by the formula.

The answer to the fourth point does not carry any clear idea when you say "all parties means parties interested."

You say "mutual agreement means agreement between contracting parties." Who are the contracting parties once a proivisonal interim government is established of your conception? Who will appoint the central or joint board of control, which will safeguard defence, etc., and on what principle, through what machinery and agency, and subject to whose control and orders will such a central or joint board be?

You say "the power is to be transferred to the nation, that is to the provisional government". That is all the greater reason why I would like to know full details of the provincial government as contemplated by you and of your conception.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 13

Dear Mr Gandhi,

When you arrived here on the morning of the 12th to resume our talks you were good enough to inform me that you had no time to attend to my letter of September 11th, which reached you the same day at 10.30 p.m. We met again today without having received your reply, and I am still waiting for it. Please, therefore, let me have your reply as soon as possible with regard to

the various points mentioned in my letter to you of September 11th.

Your sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 14

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

I have your letter of 13th instant. I understood from our talks that you were in no hurry for my answer. I was, therefore, taking the matter in a leisurely fashion even hoping that as our talks proceeded and as cordiality increased, mutual clarification would come to itself and that we would only have to record our final agreement. But I understand and appreciate the other view-point. We should take nothing for granted. I should clarify your difficulties in understanding the Rajaji formuls and you should do likewise regarding yours. i.e. the Muslim League Lahore resolution of 1940.

With reference to the Lahore resolution, as agreed between us, I shall deal with it in a separate letter.

Perhaps at the end of our discussion we shall discover that Rajaji not only has not put the Lahore resolution out of shape and mutilated it but has given it substance and form. Indeed in view of your dislike of the Rajaji formula, I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement. So much for the first paragraph of your letter.

As to the second, I do hold that unless we oust the third party we shall not be able to live at peace with one another. That does not mean that I may not make an effort to find ways and means of establishing a living peace between us.

You ask for my conception of the basis for a provisional interim government. I would have told you if I had any scheme in mind. I imagine that if we two can agree it would be for us to consult the other parties. I can say this, that any provisional government to inspire confidence at the present moment must represent all parties. When that moment arrives, I shall have been replaced by some authoritative person, though you will have me always at your beck and call when you have converted me or I you, or by mutual conversion we have become one mind functioning thorugh two bodies.

As to the third point, the provisional government being the appointing authority will give effect to the findings of the commission. This I thought was implied in my previous answer.

Rajaji tells me that absolute majority is used in his formula in the same sense as it is used in ordinary legal parlance wherever more than two groups are dealt with. I cling to my own answer. But you will perhaps suggest a third meaning and persuade me to accept it.

The form of the plebiscite and franchise must be left to be decided by the provisional interim government unless we decide it now. I should say it should be by adult suffrage of all the inhabitants of the Pakistan area.

As to the fourth, "all parties" means you and I and every one else holding views on the question at issue will and should seek by peaceful persuasion to influence public opinion as is done where democracy functions wholly or in part.

As to fifth, supposing that the result of the plebiscite is in favour of partition, the provisional government will draft the treaty and agreements as regards the administration of matters of common interest, but the same has to be confirmed and ratified by the governments of the two states. The machinery required for the settlement and administration of matters of common interest will in the first instance be planned by the interim government, but subsequently will be matter for settlement between the two governm-nts acting through the agencies appointed by each for that purpose.

As to sixth, I hope the foregoing makes superfluous any further reply.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 14

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I received your letter of September 14th at 4.45 p.m. today in reply to my letter of September 11th (and not of September 13th as you state, which seems to be a mistake) and I thank you for it.

1. Please let me have as soon as you can your promised letter indicating in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is "indefinite".

2. With regard to the provision in the Gandhi-Rajaji formula that "the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for independence", I asked you in my letter dated September 10th "Does it mean the Congress demand for indepedence as formulated in the August 1942 Resolution by the All-India Congress Committee

in Bombay, or if not, what is the significance of this term," to which you replied by your letter of September 11th "The independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands". Hence I again ask, does it mean on the basis of a united India? I find that you have not clarified the point satisfactorily.

As regards the next part of this clause, the formula proceeds to lay down that "the Muslim League will cooperate with the Congress in the formation of the provisional interim government for the transitional period", I requested you by my letter of September 10th to let me know "the basis or the lines on which such a government to be set up or constituted. If you have a complete and definite scheme, please let me have it", to which you replied by your letter of Sepetember 11th under reply that "the basis for the formation of the provisional interim government will have to be agreed to between the League and the Congress". But that is not meeting my request for clarification or giving me at least the outlines of such a government, and that is what I have been asking. I hope that you do appreciate my point when I am requesting you to let me have rough outlines of the proposed provisional interim government according to the formula, so that I may have some idea. Of course, I can quite understand that such a provisional interim government will represent all the parties and would be of a character that will inspire confidence at the present moment of all the parties. I can quite understand that when the moment arrives certain things may follow, but before we can deal with this formula in a satisfactory manner I repeat again that, as it is your formula, you should give me a rough idea of the provisional interim government that you contemplate and of your conception. What I would like to know what will be the powers of such a provisional interim government, how it will be formed, to whom it will be responsible, and what will be its composition, etc. You, being the sponsor of this Gandhi-Rajaji formula, should give me some rough idea and picture of it, so that I may understand what this part of the formula means.

In your letter of September 14th in reply to my letter of September 11th you inform me that you would have told me if you had any scheme in mind. "I imagine that if we two can agree it would be for us to consult the other parties", but that is just the point. Unless I have some outline or scheme, however arough, from you, what are we to discuss in order to reach any agreement?

As regards the other matters which you have further explained, I have noted the explanation, and I do not think I need

press you further, although some of them are not quite satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr. Gandhi's letter dated September 15

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

This is in terms of our talk of Wednesday, 13th instant.

For the moment I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore resolution of the Muslim League.

You must admit that the resolution itself makes no reference to the two nations theory. In the course of our discussions you have passionately pleaded that India contains two nations, i.e. Hindus and Muslims and that the latter have their homelands in India as the former have theirs. The more our argument progresses, the more alarming your picture appears to me. It would be alluring if it was true. But my fear is growing that it is wholly unreal. I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children.

You do not claim to be a separate nation by right of conquest but by reason of acceptance of Islam. Will the two nations become one if the whole of India accepted Islam? Will Bengalis, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamilians, Maharashtrians, Gujaratis, etc. cease to have their special characteristics if all of them became converts to Islam? These have all become one politically because they are subject to one foreign control. They are trying today to throw off that subjection.

You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood. If I accept it, I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem. The only real though awful test of our nationhood arises out of our common political subjection. If you and I throw off this subjection by our combined effort we shall be born a politically free nation out of our travail. If by then we have not learnt to prize our freedom we may quarrel among ourselves and for want of a common master holding us together in his iron grip seek to split up into small groups or nationalities. There will be nothing to prevent us from descending to that level and we shall not have to go in search of a master. There are many claimants to the throne that never remains vacant.

With this background I shall present you with my difficulty in accepting your resolution.

1. Pakistan is not in the resolution. Does it bear the original meaning Punjab, Afghanistan, Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan out of which the name was menmonically formed? If not what is it?

2. Is the goal of Pakistan Pan-Islam?

3. What is it that distinguishes an Indian Muslim from every other Indian, if not his religion? Is he different from a Turk or an Arab?

4. What is the connotation of the word "Muslim" in the resolution under discussion? Does it mean the Muslims of the India of geography or of the Pakistan to be?

5. Is the resolution addressed to the Muslims by way of education, or to the inhabitants of the whole of India by way of appeal or to the foreign ruler as an ultimatum?

6. Are the constituents in the two zones to constitute "independent states" an undefined number in each zone?

7. Is the demarcation to take place during the pendency of British rule?

8. If the answer to the last question is in the affirmative, the proposal must be accepted by Britain and then imposed upon India, not evolved from within by the free-will of the people of India.

9. Have you examined the position and satisfied yourself that these "independent states" will be materially and otherwise benefitted by being split up into fragments?

10. Please satisfy me that these independent sovereign states will not become a collection of poor states, a menace to themselves and to the rest of India.

11. Pray show me by facts and figures or otherwise how independence and welfare of India as a whole can be brought about by the acceptance of the resolution?

12. How are the Muslims under the Princes to be disposed of as a result of this scheme?

13. What is your definition of "minorities"?

14. Will you please define the "adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards" for minorities referred to in the second part of the resolution?

15. Do you not see that the Lahore Resolution contains only a bare statement of the objective and does not give any idea as to the means to be adopted for the execution of the idea and the concrete corollaries thereof? For instance,

(*a*) Are the people in the regions falling under the plan to have any voice in the matter of separation and if so, how is it to be a scertained?

(*b*) What is the provision for defence and similar matters of common concern contemplated in the Lahore Resolution?

(*c*) There are many groups of Muslims who have continuously expressed dissent from the policy of the League. While I am prepared to accept the prepondering influence and position of the League and have approached you for that very reason, is it not our joint duty to remove their doubts and carry them with us by making them feel that they and their supporters have not been practically disfranchised?

(*d*) Does this not lead again to placing the resolution of the League before the people of the zone concerned as a whole for acceptance?

As I write this letter and imagine the working of the resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India. Believe me I approach you as a seeker. Though I represent nobody but myself, I aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India, for I realise in my own person their misery and degradation which is their common lot irrespective of class, caste or creed. I know that you have acquired a unique hold on the Muslim masses. I want you to use your influence for their welfare, which must include the rest.

In this hastily writte lettern I have only given an inkling of my difficulty.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 15

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

I have yours of the 14th instant, received at 9.40 a.m.

I woke up at 3 a.m. today to finish my promised letter on the Lahore Resolution.

There is no mistake about the date for I wrote in answer to your reminder of the 13th instant.

Independence does mean as envisaged in the A.I.C.C. Resolution of 1942, But it cannot be on the basis of a united India. If we come to a settlement it would be on the basis of the settlement, assuming of course that it secures general acceptance in the country. The process will be somewhat like this. We reach by joint effort independence for India as it stands. India become free will proceed to demarcation, plebiscite and partition if the people concerned vote for partition. All this is implied in the Rajaji formula.

As to the provisional interim government I am afraid I cannot carry my answer any further than I have done. Though I have no scheme for the provisional government, if you have one in connection with the Lahore Resolution, which also I presume requires an interim government we can discuss it.

The formula was framed by Rajaji in good faith. I accepted it in equal good faith. The hope was that you would look at it with favour. We still think it to the best in the circumstances. You and I have to put flesh on it, if we can. I have explained the process we have to go through. You have no objection to it. Perhaps you want to know how I would form the provisional government if I was invited thereto. If I was in that uneviable position I would see all the claimants and endeavour to satisfy them. My cooperation will be available in that task.

I can give you full satisfaction about your inquiry, "what I would like to know would be, what will be the powers of such a provisional interim government, how it will be formed, to whom it will be responsible". The provisional interim government will be responsible to the elected members of the present Assembly or a newly elected one. It will have all the powers less that of the commander-in-chief during the War and full powers thereafter. It will be the authority to give effect to the agreement that may be arrived at between the League and the Congress and ratified by the other parties.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 17

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I have your letter of September 15th and I thank you for it. I note that you have for the moment shunted the Rajaji formula and are applying your mind very seriously to the Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League. It is my duty to explain the Lahore Resolution to you today and persude you to accept it, even

though you are talking to me, as you have often made it clear in your individual capacity. I have successfully converted non-Muslim Indians in no small number and also a large body of foreigners, and if I can convert you, exercising as you do tremendous influence over Hindu India, it will be no small assistance to me, although we are not proceeding on the footing that you are carrying on these talks in your representative character or capacity, and my difficulties remain until you are vested with a representative status and authority in order to negotiate and reach an agreement with you.

You have stated in your letter dated September 11th that the Lahore Resolution is "indefinite." I therefore naturally asked you to please let me know in what way or respect the Lahore Resolution is indefinite and now I have received your letter of September 15th under reply.

The third paragraph of your letter is not seeking clarification but a disquisition and expression of your views on the point whether the Mussalmans are a nation. This matter can hardly be discussed by means of correspondence. There is a great deal of discussion and literature on this point which is available and it is for you to judge finally, when you have studied this question thoroughly, whether the Mussalmans and Hindus are not two major nations in this sub-continent. For the moment I would refer you to two publications, although there are many more. Dr Ambedkar's book and "M.R.T's" Nationalism in Conflict in India. We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hiudus are two major nations by any definition or test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilisation, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions, in short we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of International Law we are a nation. Now I shall proceed to reply to your various points:

1. Yes the word "Pakistan" is not mentioned in the Resolution and it does not bear the original meaning. The word has now become synonymous with the Lahore Resolution.

2. This point does not arise, but still I reply that the question is a mere bogey.

3. This point is covered by my answer that the Mussalmans of India are a nation. As to the last part of your query, it is hardly relevant to the matter of clarification of the Resolution.

4. Surely you know what the word "Muslims" means.

5. This point does not arise by way of clarification of the text of the Lahore Resolution.

6. No. They will form units of Pakistan.

7. As soon as the basis and the principles embodied in the Lahore Resolution are accepted, the question of demarcation wiil have to be taken up immediately.

8. In view of my reply to (7), your question (8) has been answered.

9. Does not relate to clarification.

10. My answer to (9) covers this point.

11. Does not arise out of the clarification of the Resolution. Surely this is not asking for clarification of the Resolution. I have in numerous speeches of mine and the Muslim League in its Resolutions have pointed out that this is the only solution of India's problem and the road to achieve freedom and independence of the peoples of India.

12. "Muslims under the Princes". The Lahore Resolution is only confined to British India. This question does not arise out of the clarification of the Resolution.

13. The definition of "minorities". You yourself have often said minorities means "accepted minorities".

14. The adequate effective and mandatory safeguards for minorities referred to in the Resolution are a matter for negotiation and settlement with the minorities in the respective states, viz. Pakistan and Hindustan.

15. It does give basic principles and when they are accepted, then the details will have to be worked out by the contracting parties.

(*a*) Does not arise by way of clarification.

(*b*) Does not arise by way of clarification.

(*c*) The Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative organisation of Muslim India.

(*d*) No. See answer (*c*).

As regards your final paragraph, before receiving clarifications from me you have already passed your judgment and condemned the Lahore Resolution, when you say "As I write this letter and imagine the working of the resolution in practice. I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India". I understand that you have made clear to me that you represent nobody but

yourself, and I am trying to persuade you and to convert you that this is the road which will lead to the achievement of freedom and independence not only of the two major nations, Hindus and Muslims but of the rest of the peoples of India, but when you proceed to say that you aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India, I regret I cannot accept that statement of yours. It is quite clear that you represent nobody else but the Hindus, and as long as you do not realize your true position and the realities, it is very difficult for me to argue with you, and it becomes still more difficult to persuade you, and hope to convert you to the realities and the actual conditions prevailing in India today. I am pleading before you in the hope of converting you, as I have done with many others successfully. As I have said before, you are a great man and you exercise enormous influence over the Hindus, particularly the masses, and by accepting the road that I am pointing out to you, you are not prejudicing or harming the interests of the Hindus or of the minorities. On the contrary, Hindus will be the greatest gainers. I am convinced that true welfare not only of the Muslims but the rest of India lies in the division of India as proposed by the Lahore Resolution. It is for you to consider whether it is not your policy and programme in which you have persisted which has been the principal factor of "ruin of whole of India" and of misery and degradation of the people to which you refer and which I deplore no less than any one else. And it is for that very reason I am pleading before you all these days, although you insist that you are having these talks with me only in your individual capacity, in the hope that you may yet revise your policy and programme.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 19

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Many thanks for yours of 17th instant.

I am sorry to have to say that your answers omitting 1, 2 and 6 do not give satisfaction.

It may be that all my questions do not arise from the view of mere clarification of the Lahore Resolution. But I contend that they are very relevant from the standpoint of a seeker that I am. You cannot expect any one to agree to or shoulder the burden of the claim contained in the Lahore Resolution without, for instance, answering my questions 15 (*a*) and 15 (*b*) which you

brush aside as not arising by way of clarification.

Dr Ambedkar's thesis while it is ably written has carried no conviction to me. The other book mentioned by you, I am sorry to say, I have not seen.

Why can you not accept my statement that I aspire to represent all the sections that compose the people of India? Do you not aspire? Should not every Indian? That the aspiration may never be realized is beside the point.

I am beholden to you, in spite of your opinion about me, for having patience with me, I hope you will never lose it but will perserve in your effort to convert me. I ask you to take me with my strong views and even prejudices, if I am guilty of any.

As to your verdict on my policy and programme, we must agree to differ. For, I am wholly unrepentant. My purpose is as a lover of communal unity to place my services at your disposal.

I hope you do not expect me to accept the Lahore Resolution without understanding its implications. If your letter is the final word, there is little hope. Can we not agree to differ on the questions of "two nations" and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination? It is this basis that has brought me to you. If the regions holding Muslim majorities have to be separated according to the Lahore Resolution, the grave step of separation should be specifically placed before and approved by the people in that area.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 21

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 19th, and I have already given you my answers to all your questions relating to clarification of the Lahore Resolution or any part of it, and I am glad that you admit when you say "it may be that all my questions do not arise from the view of mere clarification of the Lahore Resolution", but you particularly emphasize your points 15 (*a*) and 15 (*b*). I regret to say it has no relation to the context of the resolution or any part thereof. You have brought so many matters into our correspondence which are entirely outside the matter requiring clarification, so I have perforce to deal with them. Let me first deal with your letter of September 11th.

You say "My life mission has been Hindu-Muslim unity which I want for its own sake but which is not to be achieved without the foreign ruling power being ousted. Hence the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is achieving independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together."

The gist of your letters up to date is that you are wedded to this policy and will pursue it. In your next letter of September 14th, while you were good enough to furnish me with the clarification of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, you were pleased to observe, "I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore Resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement". In your letter of September 15th you say "Independence does mean as envisaged in the A.I.C.C. Resolution of 1942". It is, therefore, clear that you are not prepared to revise your policy and that you adhere firmly to your policy and programme which you have persisted in and which cultimated in your demand, final policy, programme, and the method and sanction for enforcing it by resorting to mass civils disobedience in terms of 8th August 1942 resolution, and you have made it more clear again by stating in your letter of September 19th as follows: "As to your verdict on my policy and programme, we must agree to differ. For I am wholly unrepentant". You know that the August 1942 Resolution is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India. Then again in the course of our discussion when I asked you for clarification of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, you were pleased to say, by your letter of September 15th as follows: "For the moment I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League". We discussed it in its various aspects, as you told me you were open to be persuaded and converted to our point of view. I discussed the Resolution at great length with you, and explained everything you wanted to understand, even though you have emphasized more than once that you are having these talks with me in your personal capacity, and in your letter of September 15th you assured me in the following words with regard to the Lahore Resolution: "Believe me I approach you as a seeker, though I represent nobody but myself", and that you were open to conviction and conversion. You had informed me by your letter of September 11th as follows: "It is true that I said an ocean separated you and me in outlook. But that had no reference to the Lahore Resolution

of the League. The League resolution is indefinite", I naturally therefore proceeded, in reply, to ask you by my letter of September 11th as follows: "You say the Lahore Resolution is indefinite. You never asked me for any clarification or explanation of the terms of the Resolution, but you really indicated your emphatic opposition to the very basis and the fundamental principles embodied in it. I would, therefore, like to know in what way or respect the Lahore Resolution is indefinite", and I sent you a reminder on Septembr 13th to which you replied by your letter of September 15th, not confining yourself really to matters of clarification, but introducing other extraneous matters, with some of which I had already dealt, in reply to this letter of yours of September 15th by my letters of September 17th and furnished you with all the clarifications, informing you that you had introduced several matters which could hardly be discussed in a satisfactory manner by means of correspondence. I have already given you all the clarifications you require so far as the Lahore Resolution goes and its text is concerned. You again raise further arguments, reasons and grounds and continue to persist in a disquisition on the point, amongst others, whether Muslims of India are a nation, and then you proceed further to say: "Can we not agree to differ on the question of 'two nations' and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination". It seems to me that you are labouring under some misconception of the real meaning of the word 'Self-Determination'. Apart fom the inconsistencies and cantradictions of the various positions that you have adopted in the course of our correspondence, as indicated above, can you not appreciate our point of view that we claim the right of self-determination as a nation and not as a territorial unit, and that we are entitled to exercise our inherent right as a Muslim nation, which is our birthright? Whereas you are labouring under the wrong idea that "self-determination" means only that of "a territorial unit" which by the way, is neither demarcated nor defined yet, and there is no Union or Federal constitution of India in being, functioning as a sovereign Central Government. Ours is a case of division and carving out two independent sovereign states by way of settlement between two major nations, Hindus and Muslims, and not of severance or secession from any existing Union which is non-existent in India. The right of self-determination which we claim postulates that we are a nation, and as such it would be the self-determination of the Mussalmans, and they alone are entitled to exercise that right.

I hope you will now understand that your question 15 (*a*) does not arise out of the Lahore Resolution or of any part

thereof. As to 15 (*b*), again it does not arise as a matter of clarification, for it will be a matter for the constitution-making body chosen by Pakistan to deal with and decide all matters as sovereign body representing Pakistan vis-a-vis the constitution-making body of Hindustan or any other party concerned. There cannot be defence and similar matters of "common concern" when it is accepted that Pakistan and Hindustan will be two separate independent sovereign states. I hope I have now given all satisfactory explanations over and above the matter of clarification of the Lahore Resolution in the hope of converting you as an individual "seeker".

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 22

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Your letter of yesterday (21st instant) so disturbed me that I thought I would postpone my reply till after we had met at the usual time. Though I made no advance at our meeting I think I see somewhat clearly what you are driving at. The more I think about the two nations' theory the more alarming it appears to be. The book recommended by you gives me no help. It contains half truths and its conclusions or inferences are unwarranted. I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is not proof. The consequences of accepting such a proposition are dangerous in the extreme. Once the principle is admitted there would be no limit to claim for cutting up India into numerous divisions which would spell India's ruin. I have, therefore, suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be.

You seem to be averse to a plebiscite. In spite of the admitted importance of the League, there must be clear proof that the people affected desire partition. In my opinion all the people inhabiting the area ought to express their opinion specifically on this single issue of division. Adult suffrage is the best method but I would accept any other equivalent.

You summarily reject the idea of common interest between the two arms. I can be no willing party to a division which does not provide for the simultaneous safeguarding of common interests such as defence, foreign affairs and the like. There will be no feeling of security by the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical contiguity.

Your letter shows a wide divergence of opinion and outlook between us. Thus you adhere to the opinion often expressed by you that the August 1942 resolution is "inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India". There is no proof for this sweeping statement.

We seem to be moving in a circle. I have made a suggestion. If we are bent on agreeing, as I hope we are, let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 23

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 22nd and thank you for it. I am sorry that you think I have summarily rejected the idea of common interest between two arms, and now you put it somewhat differently from 15 (*b*), when you say there will be no feeling of security by the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical contiguity. My answer, already given, is that it will be for the Constitution-making body of Pakistan and that of Hindustan, or any other party concerned, to deal with such matters on the footing of their being two independent states.

I am really surprised when you say there is no proof of what you characterize as a sweeping statement of mine, that the August 1942 resolution is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India. The resolution in its essence is as follows:

(*a*) immediate grant of complete independence and setting up immediately of a federal central Government on the basis of a united democratic Government of India with federated units or provinces, which means establishing a Hindu Raj;

(*b*) that this National Government so set up will evolve a scheme for a constituent assembly, which will be chosen by adult franchise, which will prepare a constitution for the Government of India, which means that the constituent assembly chosen will be composed of an overwhelming majority of the Hindus, nearly 75 per cent;

(*c*) to enforce demand of the Congress the August resolution decides on and sanctions a resort to mass civil disobedience at your command and when ordered by you as the sole dictator of the Congress.

This demand is basically and fundamentally opposed to the

idea and demand of Muslim India of Pakistan, as embodied in the Lahore Resolution, and to enforce such a demand by means of resort to mass civil disobedience is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India, and if you succeed in realising this demand, it would be a death-blow to Muslim India. I see from the correspondence and talks between you and me that you are still holding fast to this fateful resolution.

From the very first day of our talks you made it clear to me, and you have repeatedly said in the course of our correspondence and talks, that you have approached me in your individual capacity, and you assured me that you were a seeker of light and knowledge and that you seriously and earnestly wanted to understand the Lahore Resolution and were open to conviction and conversion. Therefore, in deference to your wishes I made every effort all these days and in the course of our prolonged talks and correspondence to convert you, but unfortunately it seems to have failed. And now you have made new suggestions and proposals by your letter under reply:

(1) You say "I have therefore suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be". I really do not know what this means, and I would like you to elaborate this proposal and give me some rough outlines of this new idea of yours, as to how and when the division is to take place, and in what way it is different from the division envisaged by the Lahore Resolution.

(2) You say "let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us." May I point out that you have repeatedly made clear to me that you are having these talks as an individual seeker? How can any question of a third party or parties to guide or arbitrate between us arise?

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 23

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Last evening's talk has left a bad taste in the mouth. Our talks and our correspondence seem to run in parallel lines and never touch one another. We reached the breaking point last evening but, thank God, we were unwilling to part. We resumed discussion and suspended it in order to allow me to keep my time for the evening public prayer.

In order that all possible chance of making any mistake in a matter of this great importance may be removed I would like

you to give me in writing what precisely on your part you would want me to put my signature to.

I adhere to my suggestion that we may call in some outside assistance to help us at this stage.

Yours sincerely.
M.K. Gandhi,

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 23

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 23rd. May I refer you to my letter of today's date which I sent to you in reply to yours of September 22nd? I have nothing new or fresh to add, but I may say that it is not a case of your being asked to put your signature as representing anybody till you clothe yourself with representative capacity and are vested with authority. We stand by, as I have already said, the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore Resolution of March 1940. I appeal to you once more to revise your policy and programme, as the future of this sub-continent and the welfare of the peoples of India demand that you should face realities.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 24

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

I have your two letters of 23rd September in reply to my letters of 22nd and 23rd.

With your assistance, I am exploring the possibilities of reaching an agreement so that the claim embodied in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore may be reasonably satisfied. You must therefore have no apprehension that the August resolution will stand in the way of our reaching an agreement. The resolution dealt with the question of India as against Britain and it cannot stand in the way of our settlement.

I proceed on the assumption that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the North-West zones, i.e. Baluchistan, Sind, North-West Frontier Province and that part of the Punjab where they are in absolute majority over all the other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India.

Differing from you on the general basis I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim League Resolution of Lahore of 1940 on my basis and on the following terms:

The areas should be demarcated by a Commission approved by the Congress and the League. The wishes of the inhabitants of the areas demarcated should be ascertained through the votes of the adult population of the areas or through some equivalent method.

If the vote is in favour of separation it shall be agreed that these areas shall form a separate state as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination and can, therefore, be constituted into two sovereign independent states. There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like, which must necessarily continue to be the matters of common interest between the contracting parties.

The treaty shall also contain terms for safeguarding the rights of minorities in the two states.

Immediately on the acceptance of this agreement by the Congress and the League the two shall decide upon a common course of action for the attainment of independence of India.

The League will, however, be free to remain out of any direct action to which the Congress may resort and in which the League may not be willing to participate.

If you do not agree to these terms could you let me know in precise terms what you would have me to accept in terms of the Lahore Resolution and bind myself to recommend to the Congress? If you could kindly do this, I shall be able to see apart from the difference in approach what definite terms I can agree to. In your letter of 23rd September you refer to "the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore Resolution" and asked me to accept them. Surely this is unnecessary when I feel I have accepted the concrete consequence that should follow from such acceptance.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 25

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 24th and I thank you for it. You have already rejected the basis and fundamental principles of the Lahore Resolution.

(1) You do not accept that the Mussalmans of India are a nation.

(2) You do not accept that the Mussalmans have an inherent right of self-determination.

(3) You do not accept that they alone are entitled to exercise this right of theirs for self-determination.

(4) You do not accept that Pakistan is composed of two zones, North-West and North-East, comprising six provinces, namely Sind, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier province, the Punjab, Bengal and Assam, subject to territorial adjustments that may be agreed upon, as indicated in the Lahore Resolution. The matter of demarcating and defining the territories can be taken up after the fundamentals above-mentioned are accepted, and for that purpose machinery may be set up by agreement.

You do not accept the provisions embodied in the Lahore Resolution for safeguarding the minorities, and yet in your letter under reply you say: "With your assistance I am exploring the possibilities of reaching an agreement so that the claim embodied in the Muslim League Resolution of Lahore may be reasonably satisfied", and proceed to say "you must, therefore, have no apprehensions that the August Resolution will stand in the way of our reaching an agreement".

I have already clearly explained to you that the August resolution, so long as it stands, is a bar, for it is fundamentally opposed to the Lahore Resolution. You then proceed to say "that resolution dealt with the question of India as against Britain and it cannot stand in the way of our settlement". I am not at present concerned with Britain, but the August Resolution, as I have already stated, is against the ideals and demands of the Muslim League. Further, their is the resolution of Jagat Narayan Lal, passed by the All-India Congress Committee in May 1942 at Allahabad, which, in express terms, lays down as follows:

"The A.I.C.C. is of opinion that any proposal to disintegrate India by giving liberty to any component state or territorial unit to secede from the Indian Union or Federation will be

highly detrimental to the best interests of the people of the different states and provinces and the country as a whole and the Congress, therefore, cannot agree to any such proposal."

These two resolutions, so long as they stand, are a complete bar to any settlement on the basis of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan. It is open to the Congress to revise and modify them, but you are only speaking in your individual capacity, and even in that capacity you are holding fast to the August Resolution and you have given no indication of your attitude regarding Jagat Narayan Lal's resolution. I have repeatedly made it clear that after we had discussed the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, as you maintained that, to use your own language "Rajaji not only has not put the Lahore Resolution out of shape and mutilated it but has given it substance and form", and proceeded to say "Indeed in view of your dislike of the Rajaji formula, I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore Resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement". When I asked for further clarification, which you furnished me by your letter of September 15th you started by saying "I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance I am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League", and thence-forward the Gandhi-Rajaji formula was not discussed any further, and the question of your representative character and authority which I had pointed out from the very commencement, therefore, did not arise, as you had given me the task of converting you to the fundamentals of the Lahore Resolution and ever since we discussed the Lahore Resolution only at great length and examined the pros and cons, and finally you have rejected it. As a result of our correspondence and discussions I find that the question of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan is only on your lips and it does not come from your heart, and suddenly at the eleventh hour you put forward a new suggestion, consisting only of two sentences by your letter of September 22nd, saying, "I have therefore suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers if a division there must be". I naturally asked you what this new suggestion of yours meant and wanted you to give me rough outlines of this new idea of yours as to how and when the division is to take place and in what way it is different from the division envisaged in the Lahore Resolution, and now you have been good enough to give me your amplification, in your letter of September 24th under reply, in which you say "Differing from you on the general basis I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim

League Resolution of Lahore 1940 on my basis and on the following terms". The terms clearly indicate that your basis is in vital conflict with and is opposed to the fundamental basis and principles of the Lahore Resolution. Now let me take your main terms:

(*a*) "I proceed on the assumption that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the North-West zones, i.e. Baluchistan, Sind, North-West Forntier Province and that part of the Punjab where they are in absolute majority over all the other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India". If this term were accepted and given effect to, the present boundaries of those provinces would be maimed and mutilated beyond redemption and leave us only with the husk, and it is opposed to the Lahore Resolution.

(*b*) That even in these mutilated areas so defined, the right of self-determination will not be exercised by the Muslims but by the inhabitants of those areas so demarcated. This again is opposed to the fundamentals of the Lahore Resolution.

(*c*) That if the vote is in favour of separation, they shall be allowed to form a separate state as soon as possible after India is free from foreign dominations, whereas we propose that we should come to a complete settlement of our own immediately, and by our united front and efforts do everything in our power to secure the freedom and independence of the peoples of India on the basis of Pakistan and Hindustan.

(*d*) Next you say, "There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interests between the contracting parties". If these vital matters are to be administered by some central authority, you do not indicate what sort of authority or machinery will be set up to administer these matters, and how and to whom again that authority will be responsible. According to the Lahore Resolution, as I have already explained to you, all these matters, which are the lifeblood of any state, cannot be delegated to any central authority or government. The matters of security of the two states and the natural and mutual obligations that may arise out of physical contiguity will be for the constitution-making body of Pakistan and that of Hindustan, or other party concerned, to deal with on the footing of their being two independent states. As regards the safeguarding of

the rights of minorities, I have already explained that this question of safeguarding the minorities is fully stated in the Lahore Resolution.

You will, therefore, see that the entire basis of your new proposal is fundamentally opposed to the Lahore Resolution, and as I have already pointed out to you, both in the correspondence and in our discussions, it is very difficult for me to entertain counter-proposals and negotiate and reach any agreement or settlement with you as an individual, unless they come from you in your representative capacity. That was the same difficulty with regard to the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, and I made it clear to you at the very outset, but the formula was discussed as you asserted that it had met the Lahore Resolution in substance, but while you were furnishing me with the clarification of this formula, you shunted it and we confined ourselves to the Lahore Resolution, and hence the question of your representative capacity did not arise regarding this formula. But now you have in your letter of September 24th made a new proposal of your own on your own basis, and the same difficulties present themselves to me as before, and it is difficult to deal with it any further unless it comes from you in your representative capacity.

I cannot agree with you when you finally wind up by saying "In your letter of 23rd September you refer to the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore Resolution and ask me to accept them. Surely this is unnecessary when as I feel I have accepted the concrete consequence that should follow from such acceptance". This is obviously far from correct. Why not then accept the fundamentals of the Lahore Resolution and proceed to settle the details?

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 25

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

Yesterday's talk leads me to inflict this letter on you which I trust you will not mind.

Our conversations have come about as a result of your correspondence with Rajaji in July last over his formula and your consultations with the League Working Committee thereon, and my own letter to you suggesting a meeting between you and me. My proposal of yesterday is an earnest effort to meet the essential requirements of the Lahore Resolution. I would like you there-

fore to think fifty times throwing an offer which has been made entirely in the spirit of service in the cause of communal harmony. Do not take, I pray, the responsibility of rejecting the offer. Throw it on your Council. Give me an opportunity of addressing them. If they fell like rejecting it, I would like you to advise the Council to put is before the open session of the League. If you will accept my advice and permit me I would attend the open session and address it.

You are too technical when you dismiss my proposal for arbitration or outside guidance over points of difference. If I have approached you as an individual, and not in my representative capacity, it is because we believe that if I reach an agreement with you it will be of material use in the process of securing a Congress-League settlement and acceptance of it by the country. Is it irrelevant or inadmissible to supplement our efforts to convince each other with outside help, guidance, or even arbitration?

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 26

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 25th. It is entirely incorrect and has no foundation in fact for you to say that our conversations have come about as a result of my correspondence with Rajaji in July last over his formula. It is equally baseless to say "and your consultations with the League Working Committee thereon". It was entirely in response to your letter of July 17th, 1944 which I received while I was at Srinagar, with a fervent request on your part to meet you and you ended that letter by saying, "Do not disappoint me". In my reply, again from Srinagar dated July 24th, 1944 I intimated to you that I would be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return, which would probably be about the middle of August. This was long before the meeting of the Working Committee or that of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, and long before I reached Lahore, and when you arrived here and told me that you were approaching me in your individual capacity, I at once made it clear to you and informed you both in in our talks and by my letters, that the position you had taken up had no precedent for it, and further that it was not possible to negotiate and reach an agreement unless both the parties were fully represented. For it is one-sided business, as it will not be binding upon any organization in any sense whatever, but you would as

an individual only recommend it, if any agreement is reached, to the Congress and the country, whereas it would be binding upon me as the President of the Muslim League. I cannot accept this position. I hope you do see the unfairness and the great disadvantage to me, and it is so simple and elementary for any one to understand.

As regards your proposal of yesterday, which you have amplified in your letter of September 24th I have already sent you my reply.

With regard to your suggestion to be allowed to address the meeting of the Council, and if they feel like rejecting your "offer", the matter should be put before the open session, let me inform you that only a member or delegate is entitled to participate in the daliberations of the meetings of the Council or in the open session respectively. Besides, it is a most extraordinary and unprecedented suggestion to make. However, I thank you for your advice.

As regards your proposal for arbitration and outside guidance, I have already replied to you and it is not merely technicality but a matter of substance. I fully reciprocate your desire of securing a Congress-League settlement.

However, I regret, I have failed to convince you and convert you, as I was popeful of doing so.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Mr Gandhi's letter dated September 26

Dear Quaid-i-Azam,

In view of my letter to you of yesterday, left to myself, I would have refrained from dealing with your letter before our meeting today. But I have deferred to Rajaji's advice to finish the chain of correspondence.

I confess I am unable to understand your persistent refusal to appreciate the fact that the formula presented to you by me in my letter of the 24th as well as the formula presented to you by Rajaji give you virtually what is embodied in the Lahore Resolution providing at the same time what is absolutely necessary to make the arrangement acceptable to the country. You keep on saying that I should accept, certain theses which you call the basis and fundamental principles of the Lahore Resolution, while I have been contending that the best way for us who differ in our approach to the problem is to give body to

the demand as it stands in the resolution and work it out to our mutual satisfaction. It is on this plan that I understand, Rajaji's formula to be conceived and it is on the same plan that I have tried to work it out in the course of and as a result of our talks. I contend that either gives you the substance of the Lahore Resolution. Unfortunately you reject both. And I cannot accept the Lahore Resolution as you want me to especially when you seek to introduce into its interpretation theories and claims which I cannot accept and which I cannot ever hope to induce India to accept.

Your constant references to my not being clothed with representative authority are really irrelevant. I have approached you so that if you and I can agree upon a common course of action I may use what influence I possess for its acceptance by the Congress and the country. If you break, it cannot be because I have no representative capacity or because I have been unwilling to give you satisfaction in regard to the claim embodied in the Lahore Resolution.

Yours sincerely,
M.K. Gandhi.

Mr Jinnah's letter dated September 26

Dear Mr Gandhi,

I have received your letter of September 26th and I note that you have written it with Rajaji's advice. Of course, it is for you to follow such advice as you may choose to do so, but I am only concerned for the moment with you. I note that at the last moment, you have resurrected the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, although it was shunted all this time and you proceed to say that this formula gives me virtually what is embodied in the Lahore Resolution. You further say on the same plan you have tried to formulate your latest proposals, as metioned in your letter of September 24th and you maintain that either gives me the substance of the Lahore Resolution. In your previous letter you asserted that your formula gives me the "essence" of the Lahore Resolution. I see very close family resemblance between the two, and the substance of one or the other is practically the same, only it is put in different language, and I have already expressed my opinion that in my judgment they neither meet the substance nor the essence of the Lahore Resolution. On the contrary, both are calculated to completely torpedo the Pakistan demand of Muslim League. I have never asked you accept certain theses nor have I introduced any theories in the Lahore Resolution. Theses and theories are matters for scholars to indulge in.

I am sorry I have to repeat, but I am compelled to do so, that I cannot agree with you that my references to your not being clothed with representative authority are really irrelevant. On the contrary, they have an important bearing, as I have already explained to you more than once. You again repeat that if you and I can agree upon a common course of action, you may use what influence you possess for its acceptance by the Congress and the country. I have already stated from the very beginning that that is not enough, for the reasons I have already given. Your representative capacity comes into play when you are making counter proposals and I cannot understand how you can say that it is irrelevant. No responsible organization can entertain any proposal from any individual, however great he may be, unless it is backed up with the authority of a recognized organization and comes from its fully accredited representative. However, I need not labour this point any more, as I have already explained it in our previous correspondence.

If a break comes, it will be because you have not satisfied me in regard to the essence of the claim embodied in the Lahore Resolution. It is not a question of your being unwilling, but in fact it is so. If a break comes it will be most unfortunate. If one does not agree with you or differs from you, you are always right and the other party is always wrong, and the next thing is that many are waiting prepared, in your circle, to pillory me when the word goes, but I must face all threats and consequences, and I can only act according to my judgment and conscience.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

108

Quaid-i-Azam's Statement on Breakdown of Jinnah Gandhi Talks, 4 October, 1944

My attention has been drawn to Mr Gandhi's Press statement which was published on September 29. It is a pity that he thinks that the presence of a third party hinders a solution, and it was very painful to me when he said, "A mind enslaved cannot act as if it was free". No power can enslave the mind and soul of man, and I am sure Mr Gandhi is the last person to allow his mind to be enslaved. I do hope that he will get over this depression from which he is perpetually suffering. We have to reach an agreement of our own and find a solution in spite of that third party.

As regards the other matters, Mr Gandhi has unfortunately

initiated his propaganda in right royal style, contrary to our joint statement. Apart from challenging the representative and authoritative status of the Muslim League he is inciting Mussalmans against me, and he keeps on repeating the assertion throughout his statement that he has met the essence of the Lahore Resolution by what he now calls his offer or offers in the shape of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula and his own proposals which he put forth at the eleventh hour. Any intelligent man can now see that in substance there is no difference between the two. What he calls his own offer came after he had rejected all the essentials of the Lahore Resolution, and the Gandhi-Rajaji formula was shunted from the very commencement. Now that the matter is subject to public discussion, and as Mr Gandhi is making statement after statement and giving interviews which are so misleading, I am compelled to deal with what he calls his offer. Let us examine at least the main points.

1. Immediate grant of Independence to India as one single national unit.

2. Immediate setting up of a national provisional interim government of his conception, as defined by him in his letter of September 15, which is as follows: A provisional interim government which will be responsible to the elected members of the present Assembly or a newly elected one. It will have all the powers less those of the Commander-in-Chief during the war, and full powers thereafter. It will be the authority to give effect to the agreement that may be arrived at between the Congress and the League. By the way, it does not only recognise the existence of a third party, but hands over to him all the powers of the Commander-in-Chief during the war and the Defence, which is the most vital and overpowering Department. This clearly means the establishment immediately of a Central unitary or Federal government in charge of the entire civil administration with an over-whelming majority of Hindus in the Legislature, which will be not less than 75 per cent, to which the Cabinet will be responsible.

3. That when such a government is established it will be for this Government, so established, to frame the constitution of India or it will set up an authority which will frame the constitution of free India or it will set up an authority which will frame the constitution after the British Power is withdrawn.

4. That this National Government will draft the treaty and agreements as regards the administration of matters of common interest as now made clear in what he calls his own offer, namely, in matters such as foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like which he maintains

must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest under an efficient and satisfactory administration of a Central authority or government. This can only mean that all these vital matters which constitute the lifeblood of a State will remain vested in the national federal government proposed by him, to which finally full powers and responsibility for the Government of India will be transferred. It is therefore clear that the National Government will be brought into full being, established, and well in the saddle, according to these terms, with an overwhelming and solid majority of Hindus, which virtually would be a Hindu Raj.

5. Then we are asked to agree to the most tortuous terms and accept the principle upon which areas are to be demarcated, namely district-wise, wherein the Muslim population is in an absolute majority, which according to Mr Gandhi means that only that district will be recognized in which the Muslims have something like 75 per cent of Muslim population; for he says absolute majority, that by absolute majority he means as in Sind, Baluchistan or the North-West Frontier Province, but according to Mr Rajagopalachari, an absolute majority means as understood in legal parlance. Apart from the fact that the joint authors already differ, I find from the dictionary meaning that it means "a majority of all members of a body (including those voting and those not voting)".

6. That in areas thus demarcated, there will be a promiscuous plebiscite on the basis of adult suffrage or other practicable franchise, and the form and the franchise will be decided again by the National Government referred to above, unless we can agree upon it beforehand.

It is when we have agreed to all these terms then alone comes the question of separation of those mutilated, broken areas again subject to further conditions: (1) this matter can only be considered after the termination of the war, and (2) after the transfer of full powers and responsibility for the Government of India to this National Government, and it will be then that this National Government will set up a Commission for demarcating contiguous districts as stated above, and complete its work of sheer vandalism, especially in the Punjab, Bengal, and Assam and then its findings will be given effect to by this National Government and if these poor areas so paralysed desire to sever or separate from the all-India united, federal government, fully and firmly established, then they must submit to and go through a promiscuous plebiscite, and if the verdict is in favour of the

Muslims even then all matters of vital importance, such as foreign affairs defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like shall remain vested in and continue to be administered by a Central authority or Government.

This is what Mr Gandhi calls a partition or division between two brothers, and it is really amazing that he should repeat ad nausem that he has by his offer satisfied the essence or substance of the Lahore Resolution. It would be difficult to conceive or a more disingenuous, tortuous and crooked assertion, which he keeps on repeating naively.

What is the use of misleading people and making confusion worse confounded? If we accept these terms, which present us with a veritable trap and a slough of death, it means the burial of Pakistan. But I see some ray of hope still when he says, "If Rajaji and I have stultified the Lahore Resolution, we should be educated."

I tried to do so, as far as Mr Gandhi was concerned, for three weeks, but his ailment is so long standing and so chronic that it is beyond the reach of a physician.

I hope that his appeal to the press and the public to educate him will not fall on deaf ears. But when he was asked, what next, he was pleased to say, "I shall act as the inner voice tells". For an ordinary mortal like me there is no room in the presence of his "inner voice".

Mr Gandhi may sincerely believe that he has complied with the essentials of the Lahore Resolution by his own offer or by the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, but it is pure imagination and a delusion. The language and the terms of both, as clarified by Mr Gandhi, show they are like the Siamese Twins, and it is impossible to maintain that either of them satisfies any of the essentials embodied in the Lahore Resolution.

His contradiction and inconsistencies even in a single letter, however short, are beyond measure, and the sum total of all that has happened during the past four weeks presents one with a Chinese puzzle. I will give one instance amongst many:

"Where there is an obvious Muslim majority, they should have the fullest right to constitute themselves into a separate State. But if it means utterly independent sovereignty so that there is nothing in common between the two. I hold it as an

impossible proposition. Then it means a fight to the knife."

Here is an apostle and a devotee of non-violence threatening us with a fight to the knife, and according to him the talks have only been adjourned sine die. But apart from that, what kind of separate States does he then concede to the obvious Muslim majority in their their national homelands?

Mr Gandhi, perhaps under provocation, again asserted that he has never admitted the claim of the Muslim League as the only authoritative organization of the Muslims and darkly hinted that there are other Muslim organizations with a large body of Muslim opinion behind them who do not see eye to eye with the League and do not support the two-nation theory. Thereby he has again made an attempt to discredit the Muslim League and disrupt the Mussalmans, for he knows that that is not true. Of course, no nation can attain absolute and complete unanimity, cent per cent.

In one breath Mr Gandhi agrees to the principle of division, and in the next he makes proposals which go to destroy the very foundations on which the division is claimed by Muslim India. On the one hand he wants a League-Congress agreement, and on the other he denies its representative character and authority to speak on behalf of the Mussalmans of India. Mr Gandhi is an enigma.

Mr Jinnah elucidated a number of questions put by Pressmen regarding the boundaries of the Pakistan State. He was asked if any machinery would be set up to decide the case of predominantly non-Muslim border areas of their intention to join Pakistan or Hindustan. Mr Jinnah referred a questioner to the Lahore resolution which stated that the division should be on the basis of the present boundaries of the six provinces, i.e. the North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab, Sind, Bengal, Assam and Baluchistan, subject to territorial adjustments that might be necessary. He emphasised the words "subject to" and explained that territorial adjustments did not apply to one side only but to both sides, Hindustan and Pakistan. "I made it clear", Mr Jinnah said, "that if we agree on the fundamentals of the Lahore Resolution then the question of demarcating or defining the boundaries can be taken up later in the same way as a question of boundaries arising between two nations is solved. It will be like one Government negotiating with the other and arriving at a settlement.

"But there are no Governments here", interrupted a reporter. Mr Jinnah said that the two parties would set up con-

stitution-making bodies which would deal with the matter or even before that they might arrive at an agreement. "Is there any possibility of your meeting, Mr Gandhi in the near future?" he was asked. Mr Jinnah said, "Mr Gandhi says that it depends on the inner voice. I have no admission to that place. I cannot say".

The Muslim League President was asked whether he had any scheme for the constitution of Pakistan. Mr Jinnah said that the principle of Pakistan should be first accepted and the scheme would be formulated thereafter. Further explaining the point, Mr Jinnah referred to a previous question, namely, the absence of two contracting Governments on behalf Hindustan and Pakistan, and said that it was true there were no 'de jure' Governments. If the principle of division was accepted then it followed that both Hindustan and Pakistan would have to choose their own constitution-making bodies. Those bodies as representing two sovereign States would deal with questions of mutual and natural relations and obligations by virtue of the physical contiguity, and would then as two independent sovereign States —two nations—come to an agreement on various matters.

"Take the case of the continent of America", he said, "There are 25 independent sovereign states in South and North America. They have their treaties and agreements with regard to their mutual interests. Even so, the States in Europe have their own agreements with each other for trade, commerce, and even alliances. These are things that can be adjusted. Agreements and treaties are entered into even between two countries that have no physical contiguity. Here, the two nations are neighbours and have physical contiguity."

Earlier, Mr Jinnah said that one important issue which he had dealt with in his statement was whether the offer or offers of Mr Gandhi have either of them satisfied the essence or substance of the Lahore resolution. He had explained fully. "Mr Gandhi says", Mr Jinnah added, that if his formula or Rajagopalachari's formula stultified the Lahore Resolution, then they should be educated. To that my answer is: "I have made my contribution for 21 days and am still making that contribution; and, so far as the public is concerned, I hope it will not fall on deaf ears." Mr Gandhi in his statement and interviews has attempted to discredit the League and cause disruption among Mussalmans. I naturally resent it and he will get his answer.

109

Quaid-i-Azam's Interview to the Representative of the "News Chronicle", London, 4th October, 1944

"There is only one practical, realistic way of resolving Muslim-Hindu differences. This is to divide India into the two sovereign parts of Pakistan and Hindustan by the recognition of the whole of the North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Sind, Punjab, Bengal and Assam as sovereign Muslim territories as they now stand, and for each of us to trust the other to give equitable treatment to Hindu minorities in Pakistan and Muslim minorities in Hindustan. We are prepared to trust twenty-five million Muslims to them if they will trust us." This view was expressed to me today by Mr Jinnah in a two and a half hour conversation on his talks with Mr Gandhi. "The offer made to us", said Mr Jinnah, "is an insult to intelligence. I was asked to agree to a plebiscite where Muslims are not in absolute majority. What was meant by absolute majority? I asked Mr Gandhi. His reply meant that only where we are more than seventy per cent of the entire population should we be given control without a vote. In this he differed from Mr Rajagopalachari, who said we should accept the legal definition of absolute majority, which means fifty-one per cent of the entire population of an election area, including people who do not vote—not fifty-one per cent of the poll. A child can see that no party could hope to secure this. So I am asked to agree to a plebiscite which will probably leave a mutilated and unworkable Pakistan. This plebiscite would take place after the war and after I had agreed to cooperate in an interim National Government in which seventy-five per cent of the seats will be held by Hindus. It would, therefore, be a Hindu majority Government, which would, when it becomes a permanent federal Government, set up the post-war Commission for demarcating frontiers and arranging the plebiscite. I am asked to agree, before the plebiscite and therefore before I know what Pakistan will be, to working arrangements on defence, finance, foreign affairs, commerce, customs, communications, etc., as a condition of our being allowed to have any kind of Pakistan at all, and it will be with a seventy-five per cent Hindu majority Government with which we shall have to agree. What should we have left? A Pakistan probably pitted with islands of Hindustan not only on the frontiers but deep within Pakistan territory and further subject to control over these most vital matters of this National Government. This is not independence.

It is a form of provincial autonomy subject always in the most vital matters to an overwhelmingly Hindu federal authority. So long as Muslims are in minority, and they always will be, any such arrangement must leave us dependent on the Hindu majority rule. I asked Mr Gandhi to define the Constitution under which such a Federation would work. These are matters of fundamental importance. How could I agree to the scrapping of the present Constitution and framing of a new one as a substitute, as proposed by Mr Gandhi on the basis of a united India democratic, parliamentary Government which would come into operation at once. If we agree to this, the question of Pakistan would be shelved to Doomsday and practically buried. That is what Mr Gandhi wanted me to do. "If you do not give me what I want", says Mr Gandhi, "I will reserve the right to resort to mass civil disobedience". I cannot be accused of being pro-British. No Indian worthy of the name wants foreign domination. But don't you see that if I agreed to join this threat, it could only be by my accepting the Congress demands, which are opposed to Pakistan, and if the British Government surrendered, Muslim India would be faced not only by Hindu majority but a Hindu majority triumphant with British cooperation. If Mr Gandhi does not mean to resort to civil disobedience, he should say so and withdraw the August Resoultion. He doesn't withdraw it. He re-emphasizes it. The fact is the Hindus want some kind of agreement which will still give them some form of control over Muslims. They will not reconcile themselves to our complete independence. There was another fundamental obstacle in our way. Mr Gandhi talked in his personal capacity, I as the President of the Muslim League. I told him: if we agree and my Committee rejects the agreement, I am discredited. If your Committee turns you down, you can say 'I was talking as an individual, and you are as you were. Mr Gandhi has also said that the presence of the British impedes our agreement. There are some Britishers who do not want agreement, but there is nothing to prevent us agreeing. We have free minds and souls. No power can frustrate our coming to any agreement in ten minutes if the Muslim claim to complete independence is recognised. Then only we shall have true cooperation between Muslim and Hindu. It wlll be freely given by men who are masters in their own houses and not because one is subject to the domination of another and must therefore submit to the other's point of view.

100

Quaid-i-Azam's Statement on the Position of the Muslim League Party vis-a-vis the Unionist Party in the Punjab Legislative Assembly, Lahore, April, 1944

"The question that has been brought to my notice is whether the members of the Muslim League Party in the Punjab Assembly owe their allegiance to the defunct Unionist Party's creed, policy and programme and can remain in the Muslim League Party. There cannot be any divided loyalty."

Thus said Mr M. A. Jinnah in the course of a statement to the press issued from Lahore prior to his departure for Delhi.

"Those members of the Muslim League Party", he added "if they are under the impression that they are bound by the creed, policy and programme of the so-called Unionist Party, are wrong. You cannot owe allegiance to two political parties. There can be no divided loyalty so far as the Muslim League is concerned."

He pointed out that owing to the unfortunate death of the father of Malik Khizr Hayat Khan, leader of the Muslim League Party in the Assembly, the discussions regarding this matter were interrupted, and his absence from Lahore has naturally delayed the matter.

"I want to make it quite clear", he emphasised that there is no question of our being bound by any commitment to any one which stands in our way, nor are we under any obligation to any other party in the present coalition, which in any way constitutes any bar or precludes us from taking any deision or decisions we think proper, consistently with our creed, policy and programme.

Mr Jinnah referred to his talks with Sir Chhotu Ram, Revenue Minister and Sardar Beldev Singh, Development Minister.

Concluding, Mr Jinnah said that he would take up the thre ad as soon as possible, in the first instance, with Malik Khizr Hyat Khan, leader of the Muslim League Party, before the end of this month when he hopes to return to Lahore.

The following is the full text of the statement: "I had been

receiving various reports for some time now which conveyed to me that the Punjab Provincial Muslim League and the Muslim League Assembly Party were not fully and efficiently organised and working systematically. This brought me to the Punjab. I have been here now for more than a fortnight, and I wanted to examine the situation personally. I have seen and met a large body of people and heard various veiws, and I find that the issue before us is how best to put real life in the Muslim League orgnisation in the Punjab.

"Among others one of the matters that engaged any attention was the Muslim League Party in the Legislature. The question that is brought to my notice is whether the members of the Muslim League Party, who owe their allegiance to the defunct Unionist Party's creed, policy and programme can remain in the Muslim League Assembly Party. There cannot be any divided loyalty.

"The creed of the so-called Unionist Party is Dominion Status and a united Democratic Federal constitution for India as a whole. Its policy and programme are mainly in the interests of one class—the zamindars—whereas the Muslim League is the people's party and the custodian and trustee of all interests and classes that constitute the Muslim nation. Hence, subject to such arrangements as may by arrived at for the purposes of coalition, its fundamental and basic principles are quite different from that of the Unionist. We cannot be tied down to the creed, policy and programme of the so-called Unionist Party.

"Having ascertained the facts I naturally discussed this matter with the leader of the Party, Malik Khizr Hyat Khan, and with a large body of members of the Muslim League Party in the Assembly. The Muslim League Party is subject to the control and supervision of the Provincial and the All-India Muslim League, and it is bound to comply with the final decisions of the All-India Muslim League. This question is entirely a matter of our internal affairs and does not affect any other party or group in the Assembly. Owing to the unfortunate death of the father of Malik Khizr Hyat Khan, leader of the Muslim League Party in the Assembly, the discussions regarding this matter were interrupted, and his absence from Lahore has naturally delayed the matter. I feel that it would be hardly right and proper that Malik Khizr Hyat Khan should be disturbed at this moment of his sad bereavement.

"I want to make it clear that there is no question of our being bound by any commitments to any one which stand in

our way, nor are we under any obligation to any other party in the present coalition, which in any way constitutes any bar or precludes us from taking any decision or decisions we think proper, consistently with our creed, policy and programme. Those members of the Muslim League Party if they are under the impression that they are bound by the creed, policy and programme of the so-called Unionist Party are wrong.

"You cannot owe allegiance to two political parties. There can be no divided loyalty, so far as the League is concerned.

"The so-called pact clearly lays down that we may continue the present coalition or enter into any other coalition before or after the election. The present coalition is merely at will and formed for specific purposes. The question of the label or the name of the party, namely, the Unionist Party, arises, because it is calculated to mislead the public, and has been in fact utilised, and it is openly claimed because of its label that the members of the Muslim League Party are Unionist first and Muslim Leaguers next and are bound by the creed, policy and programme of the so-called Unionist Party. It follows that if this position is accepted, the Muslim League Party in the Assembly is a mere creature of the Unionists; and further it is insisted that, if we take steps to clarify this matter and put our Muslim League Party in the Assembly on a clean basis, then Sir Chhotu Ram would have nothing to do with the Muslim League Party at all, and we are threatened that it must lead to the dissolution and break of the present coalition.

"I think that the honour and conscience of every member of the Muslim League Party demands that he must clearly declare that his allegiance and loyalty is either pledged to the one party or the other. We are, therefore, determined to put our house in order on sound, healthy and honourable basis. Although this is a matter of our internal concern, I thought it proper to consult Sir Chhotu Ram as representing his group as a member of the present coalition.

"I put our case before him, and we have had a free and frank discussion regarding this matter. So far, Sir Chhotu Ram is adamant, and insists and maintains that every member of the Muslim League Party in the Assembly owes his primary allegiance to the creed, policy, and programme of the so-called Unionist Party, and is bound by it. This position taken up by him is utterly untenable and it is now for us to consider what decision we should take in the matter.

"So far as Sardar Beldev Singh (Development Minister) and

Sir Manoharlal (Finance Minister) are concerned, they never were Unionists and had have nothing whatever to do with the so-called Unionist Party. Although they are in the present coalition, they only recognise the Ministerial Party and not the so-called Unionist Party.

"Hence, having regard to the composition of the present coalition in which the Muslim League Party is by far the largest and majority party, it was suggested that the label, Unionist Porty, which even now is not recognised by Sardar Baldev Singh and Sir Manoharlal, should be dropped, and the present coalition should be called the Muslim League Coalition Party which, in fact, is the true position, and this change of label cannot and does not affect the continuance of the present coalition, so long as the parties concerned desire to maintain it.

"Coalitions are formed for certain specific purpose only, and the respective parties to the coalition do not forswear their allegiance or give up the allegiance to the creed, policy and fundamental programme of their respective parties.".

"I am thankful to Sardar Baldev Singh who was good enough to see me, and I had the opportunity of having a free and frank talk with him also. I have to leave for Delhi tonight, but the thread will be taken up by me as soon as possible, in the first instance, with Malik Khizr Hyat Khan, leader of the Muslim League Party. I hope to return to Lahore before the end of this month".

111

Quaid-i-Azam's Statement on the Breakdown of his Talks with the Premier of Punjab, Malik Khizr Hayt Khan, Lahore, 27 April, 1944

We (Mr Jinnah and Malik Khizr Hyat Khan) have had prolonged discussions; and since my arrival here for the second time, in continuation of our previous discussions which started as far back as March 19, I met Malik Khizr Hyat Khan on April 20, and he has discussed the matter with me during half a dozen interviews lasting over two hours or three hours on each occasion, and he had promised to give me his final reply today.

"He arrived at my house this afternoon. When I asked him what was his final attitude and that of Sir Chhotu Ram and Sardar Baldev Singh regarding the proposals which I had placed before him and them was, he then verbally told me many things,

and I suggested that in fairness to him and me it is better that he should give me the final reply in writing, so that there should be no room for any misunderstanding. Accordinly, when he was here I dictated a letter to my private secretary. It was typed and handed over to him on the understanding that he will let me have his final reply in writing by 9 o'clock tonight, as I made it clear to him that we had discussed the whole question threadbare, and that it was not possible for me to wait any longer, specially as I was booked to leave for Sialkot tomorrow.

"He promised to let me have his reply by 9 o'clock tonight. I waited for the reply and at 9.20 p.m. I rang him up saying that I had not received from him the promised reply in writing.

"Much to my surprise on telephone he informed me that he had no reply to give except what he had told me verbally.

"Thereupon I sent him a letter, same date, after this telephonic conversation between him and me at about 9.30 p.m. I sent this letter with a responsible person to make sure that it was delivered to him. When he went there Malik Khizr Hyat Khan declined to acknowledge even the receipt of the letter on slip of paper which was sent along with the letter.

"I had again to send Nawab of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, and Mumtaz Daultana, M.L.A. with the letter and the slip on which he was requested to acknowledge the receipt, but he again declined to sign the receipt and receive the letter. I had to send them a second time to deliver the letter personally to Malik Khizr Hyat Khan, and endorse upon that acknowledgement slip that they had in fact delivered the letter personally to him. This was on April 27 at 11 p.m. and their endorsement runs as follows":

"We have personally delivered this letter to Malik Khizr Hyat Khan on April 27 at 11 p.m. and he refuses to acknowledge receipt of it. Therefore, we hereby state that we have in fact delivered the letter to him personally and certify to that effect.

(Sd.) Iftikhar Hussain Khan,
Mumtaz Daultana".

Malik Khizr Hyat Khan has neither answered my first letter of April 27, which was delivered to him personally today, nor my second letter of which he refused to acknowledge the receipt giving final reply in writing as to what Sir Chhotu Ram, Sardar Baldev Singh and he himself had to say with regard to the proposals of ours, which now had been the subject-matter of

discussion since my arrival in Lahore and had been discussed threadbare. The proposals are:

(1) that every member of the Muslim League Party in the Punjab Assembly should declare that he owes his allegiance solely to the Muslim League Party in the Assembly and not to the Unionist Party or any other party;

(2) that the present label of the coalition should be dropped, namely, "the Unionist Party"; and

(3) that the name of the proposed coalition should be the Muslim League Coalition Party.

As Malik Khizr Hyat Khan has not replied to me yet 00·30 hours—it is now for the Muslim League to decide what course of action they should take.

The following is the text of the letter delivered personally by Mr Jinnah to Malik Khizr Hyat Khan:

"Dear Malik Khizr Hyat Khan,

We have had prolonged discussions, and I shall feel obliged if you will be good enough to let me know your final decision with regard to the three points (mentioned above).

Please let me know to what extent Sir Chhotu Ram and Sardar Baldev Singh agree with all these three proposals or any of them, and also whether you agree with all these three proposals or any of them. I hope that you will let me have your reply by this evening as it is not possible to wait any longer.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. Jinnah."

The following is the text of the second letter addressed by Mr Jinnah to Malik Khizr Hyat Khan which the Nawab of Mamdot and Mr Mumtaz Daultana went to deliver to the Premier:

"Dear Malik Khizr Hyat Khan,

"You promised to send me your reply to my letter dated April 27 which was given to you this afternoon, by 9 o'clock at the latest tonight and I waited for it and rang you up that I was waiting for a reply because it was nearly 9.20 p.m. I received an answer from you that you have no reply to give except what you told me verbally. That is going back on your promise to give me your reply in writing. You said so many things verbally to me that it was impossible to know what your position was.

I once more request you to give me your reply in writing, and if I do not hear from you immediately in reply to this letter I shall conclude that you do not accept the three proposals or any of them that were made in my letter; and inview of this the Muslim League now will have to decide as to what course of action they should adopt.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. Jinnah."

112

Resolutions Passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League in connection with Lord Wavell's Plan for Formation of Provisional Government, Simla, 29 June, 1945 to 9, July 1945

(a) The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League after giving careful consideration to the following letter placed before it by the President, All-India Muslim League:

Letter dated 29th June 1945 from His Excellency the Viceroy's Private Secretary to Mr M.A. Jinnah.

Dear Mr Jinnah,

The following is the action which His Excellency would like you to take if, after consultation with your Working Committee, you are able to accept the suggestion he made at this morning's meeting of the conference:

(I) To prepare and send him a list giving the names of members of the Muslim League who, in your opinion could suitably be included in the proposed Executive Council. The number of names in this list should not be less than eight or more than twelve.

(2) If you think you can usefully suggest, for possible inclusion in the Executive Council, the names of persons of any community who are not members of the Muslim League, you are at liberty to add them to your list, keeping them distinct from the names of Muslim League members, His Excellency hopes he made it clear this morning that this is entirely optional. His Excellency's intention is to scrutinize the lists sent to him and to see whether, from them and possibly from additional names of his own he can, on paper, form an Executive Council

likely to be acceptable to the parties and to His Majesty's Government. If so, he will consult leaders including yourself, and thereafter decide whether it is worth while making definite proposals to the Conference."

resolved that the President be authorized to send the following reply:

Letter dated 7th July 1945 from Mr M. A. Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy:

Dear Lord Wavell,

I placed before my Working Committee the suggestion made by your Excellency at the last meeting of the Conference and communicated to me by your Private Secretary in his letter dated the 29th of June 1945. The Working Committee after careful consideration, desire me to convey to you their views, which are:

(1) With regard to your suggestion for submitting a panel of the members of the Muslim League for inclusion in the proposed Executive Council, the Working Committee desires to point out that when a similar proposal was made by your Excellency's predecessor, Lord Linlithgow, in connection with his offer of August 1940, the Working Committee opposed it and, when its objections were brought to the notice of Lord Linlithgow, he dropped the proposal and suggested another alternative in his letter dated the 25th of September 1940, addressed to the President of the All-India Muslim League, and extract from which is given below:

"I appreciate, however, the difficulties which, you made it clear to me, confronted you in connexion with the formulation of the panel which I had earlier suggested to you; and in the light of our discussion I am content that the selection of representatives, while resting with the Governor General, should be based in the cases of the Muslim League (and, should they so desire of the other parties to be represented in my Council) not on a panel formally submitted, but on confidential discussion between the leader of the party concerned and myself."

This alternative was acceptable to the Muslim League. The Working Committee is of the opinion that the procedure settled on the previous occasion should be followed in the present case so far as the Muslim League is concerned.

(2) Further, the Working Committee is emphatically of the opinion that all the Muslim members of the proposed Executive

Council should be chosen from the Muslim League, subject to a confidential discussion between Your Excellency and the President of the Muslim League, before they are finally recommended by you to the Crown for appointment. The Working Committee feels very strongly on this point and regards it as one of the fundamental principles.

(3) Besides the foregoing, certain other points were also discussed in the Working Committee, particularly the question of providing an effective safeguard against unfair decisions of the majority. While the Committee appreciated the remarks in the statement of the Secretary of State in the House of Commons that the power of veto will be exercised by the Viceroy to protect the minority interests, it was felt that some other effective safeguard would be necessary, in the interest of smooth working of the interim arrangement. It was, however, thought that this question could be settled after the strength and the composition of the Executive Council was decided upon.

I have given in the above paragraphs the unanimous opinion of my Working Committee and I am ready and willing, if you so desire, to meet you and explain the reasons and the grounds for the decision arrived at by the Working Committee."

(*b*) The Working Committee after giving their careful consideration to the following letter received from His Excellency the Viceroy:

Letter dated 9th July, 1945 from H.E. Lord Wavell to Mr M. A. Jinnah:

"Dear Mr Jinnah,

At the end of our talk yesterday evening you said that I could make your problem easier if I replied in writing to your letter of July 7. I do not think you expect any comment now on the first and third points in that letter. Our talk was concerned mainly with the second point, "that all the Muslim members of the proposed Executive Council should be chosen from the Muslim League . . . . before they are finally recommended to the Crown for appointment.

I fully appreciate your difficulties, but regret that I am unable to give you the guarantee you wish, i.e. that all the Muslim members of the proposed new Council shall necessarily be members of the Muslim League. As I explained to you, I cannot commit myself to give a similar guarantee to any other party.

I have to attempt to form an Executive Council representative, competent, and generally acceptable, but of course I cannot

compel any person or any party to co-operate in my own solution if they do not wish to do so.

It will help me greatly if you will let me have names from the Muslim League and I sincerely hope you will do so. I asked for eight, but will certain accept five if you do not wish to send more. You can consider later whether any solution I put forwrd is acceptable to you.

During the next two or three years decisions of great importance will have to be taken by the Government of India, whatever its composition may be. These decisions—on demobilization, economic develompent, taxation, trade and so on—cannot wait, and it is the hope of His Majesty's Government that the Executive Council responsible for them will be one in which the major political parties are represented. It will be of course my principal duty to see fairplay between all parties not only in the composition of the proposed Council but in its working.

I need the active help of your colleagues and yourself and I am sure you will give it to me. I have no objection to your showing this letter to your colleagues, but it is not intended for publication."

resolved that the President is authorised to send the following reply:

Letter dated 9th July, 1945 from Mr M.A. Jinnah, President, All-India Muslim League to His Excellency the Viceroy:

"Dear Lord Wavell,

I thank you for your letter of July 9, which I placed before my Working Committee. The Committee after giving its very careful considerartion to the matter, desires me to state that it regrets very much to note that Your Excellency is not able to give the assurance that all the Muslim members of the proposed Executive Council will be selected from the Muslim League. In my letter of July 7, I mentioned that the Committee considers this as one of the fundamental principles, and, in the circumstances, I regret I am not in a position to send the names on behalf of the Muslim League for inclusion in the proposed Executive Council as desired by you.

I should like to assure Your Excellency that it has been the earnest desire of the Committee and myself to assist you in every reasonable way, but it is not possible for us to depart from our fundamental principles.

I need not, therefore, at present say anything more with regard to the other points raised."

(c) The Working Committee after hearing the proceedings of the concluding session of the Simla Conference reported by the President, resolved that the stand taken by the President of the All-India Muslim League in regard to the Wavell Plan be approved.

113

Quaid-i-Azam's Statement on the Failure of the Simla Conference 14 July, 1945

On a final examination and analysis of the Wavell Plan, we found that it was a snare. There was the combination consisting of Gandhi-Hindu Congress, which stand for India's Hindu national independence as one India and the latest exponent of geographical unity, Lord Wavell, and Glancy-Khizr who are bent upon creating disruption among the Mussalmans in the Punjab, and we were sought to be pushed into this arrangement, which, if we had agreed to, as proposed by Lord Wavell, we would have signed our death warrant.

Our stand has been, and we have repeatedly made it clear to the British Government several times since 1940, that we cannot consider or enter into any provisional interim Government unless a declaration is made by the British Government guaranteeing the right of self-determination of Muslims and pledging that after the war, or so soon as it may be possible, the British Government would establish Pakistan having regard to the basic principles laid down in the Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League passed in March 1940. This was condition No.1 to our considering any provisional arrangement. Condition No. 2 was that we are not a minority but a nation and we can only enter into provisional arrangement, having regard to the necessities and exigencies of the moment created by the war and fully co-operate in the prosecution of the war and that in any arrangement we claimed equal number in the proposed executive

The Wavell proposals set at nought both these conditions and called upon us to make the severest sacrifice. I know in his broadcast he said that these proposals are without prejudice to any future constitution or constitutions of India. While in one breath it is impressed upon us that these proposals are without prejudice and do not prejudge the Pakistan issue, yet the Plan in fact contradicts this in the next breath by its very terms. It is obvious to any intelligent man that if we accept this arrange-

ment the Pakistan issue will be shelved and put in the cold storage indefinitely, whereas the Congress will have secured under this arrangement what they want, namely a clear road for their advance towards securing Hindu national independence of India, because the future Executive will work as a unitary Government of India and we know that this interim or provisional arrangement will have a way of settling down for an unlimited period and all the forces in the proposed Executive plus the known policy of the British Government and Lord Wavell's strong inclination for a united India, would completely jeopardise us, for, I will quote Mr Amery, who has tried his best but in the result given us cold comfort and his statement is a very clear indication and a pointer to British policy. Speaking in the House of Commons, where he presented the White Paper, he said as follows:

"The ideal to which we have always looked is that of an All-India Union in which the States would play their full part. At the same time we have also recognised the possibility that agreement between Hindus and Muslims on any form of India unity may be unattainable. Any interim advance, therefore, must in no way prejudge the question whether the ultimate settlement is based on a united or a divided India."

Next, in the proposed Executive we would be reduced to a minority of one-third. All the other minorities, such as the Scheduled castes, Sikhs and Christians have the same goal as the Congress. They have their grievances as minorities but their goal and ideology both cannot be different from or otherwise than that of United India. Ethically and culturally they are very closely knitted to the Hindu society. I am not against full justice being done to all minorities and they should be fully safeguarded and protected as such, wherever they may be. But in the actual working and practice, invariably their vote will be against us and there is no safeguard for us except the Viceroy's veto, which, it is well-known to any constitutionalist, cannot be exercised lightly as every-day business against majority decisions with regard to the policy and the principles that will have to be laid down and measures adopted, both administrative and legislative.

On the top of this game, the last straw on camel's back that even about the five members of the Muslim bloc which were allotted to us community-wise, which is the essence of Wavell proposals, we were told that the Muslim League was not entitled to nominate all the Muslim representatives as our chosen spokesmen and there were two claims—the Congress claimed two, and

Glancy-Khizr on behalf of the Punjab claimed one. This move on the part of these two went at the very root and the very existence of the Muslim League regarding its position, character and status. But finally we broke as Lord Wavell insisted upon his having one non-League nominee of Malik Khizar Hayat Khan representing Punjab Muslims. As I have said, it is only the blind who cannot see that the All-India Muslim League is the only authoritative representative organisation of the Mussalmans. If we had accepted this position as presented to us by Lord Wavell, we would have emerged out of this conference minus everything and we would have entirely betrayed our people. It would have been an abject surrender on our part of all we stand for and it would have been a death-knell to the Muslim League. This was the position which faced us and we found that it was impossible for us to accept this arrangement.

114

Resolution passed at the All-India Muslim League Legislators' Convention held at Delhi, 9 April, 1946[1]

Whereas in this vast sub-continent of India a hundred million Muslims are the adherents of a Faith which regulates every department of their life (educational, social, economic and political), whose code is not confined merely to spiritual doctrines and tenets or rituals and ceremonies and which stand in sharp contrast to the exclusive nature of Hindu Dharma and Philosophy which has fostered and maintained for thousands of years a rigid Caste System resulting in the degradation of 60 million human beings to the position of untouchables, creation of unnatural barriers between man and man and superimposition of social and economic inequalities on a large body of the people of this country, and which threatens to reduce Muslims, Christians and other minorities to the status of irredeemable helots, socially and economically;

whereas the Hindu Caste System is a direct negation of nationalism, equality, democracy and all noble ideals that Islam stands for;

whereas, different historical backgrounds, traditions, cultures and social and economic order of the Hindus and Muslims have

1. The resolution was moved by the late Mr H.S. Suhrawardy, then Chief Minister of Bengal.

made impossible the evolution of a single Indian nation inspired by common aspirations and ideals and whereas after centuries they still remain two distinct major nations;

whereas soon after the introduction by the British of the policy of setting up political institutions in India on the lines of Western democracies based on majority rule which meant that the majority of one nation or society could impose its will on the majority of the other nation or society in spite of their opposition as was amply demonstrated during the two and a half years regime of Congress Government in the Hindu majority provinces under the Government of India Act, 1935 when the Muslims were subjected to untold harassment and oppression as a result of which they were convinced of the futility and ineffectiveness of the so-called safeguards provided in the Constitution and in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governors and were driven to the irresistible conclusion that in a united Indian Federation, if established, the Muslims even in majority provinces would meet with no better fate and their rights and interests could never be adequately protected against the perpetual Hindu majority at the centre;

Whereas the Muslims are convinced that with a view to save Muslim India from the domination of the Hindus and in order to afford them full scope to develop themselves according to their genius, it is necessary to constitute a sovereign independent State comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East zone and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan in the North-West zone;

this Convention of the Muslim League Legislators of India, Central and Provincial, after careful consideration hereby declares that the Muslim Nation will never submit to any constitution for a United India and will never participate in any single constitution making-machinery set up for the purpose, and that any formula devised by the British Government for transferring power from the British to the peoples of India, which does not conform to the following just and equitable principles calculated to maintain internal peace and tranquillity, in the country, will not contribute to the solution of the Indian problem:

(1) that the zones comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan in the North-West of India; namely Pakistan zones, where the Muslims are in a dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent State and that an unequivocal

undertaking be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without dellay;

(2) that two separate constitution-making bodies be set up by peoples of Pakistan and Hindustan for the purpose of framing their respective constitutions;

(3) that the minorities in Pakistan and Hindustan be provided with safeguards on the lines of the All-India Muslim League Resolution passed on the 23rd, March 1940, at Lahore;

(4) that the acceptance of the Muslim League demand of Pakistan and its implementation without delay are the *sine qua non* for the Muslim League co-operation and participation in the formation of an interim Government at the Centre.

This Convention further emphatically declares that any attempt to impose a constitution on a united India basis or to force any interim arrangement at the Centre contrary to the Muslim League demand will leave the Muslims no alternative but to resist such imposition by all possible means for their survival and national existence.

115

Resolutions on Negotiations with the Cabinet Mission passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, 25 and 28 April and 10 and 13 May at New Delhi and Simla

The Working Committee considered the following letter dated 27 April, 1946 placed before them by the President which he had received from Lord Pethick-Lawrence, the Secretary of State for India.

Text of Letter, dated 27th April, 1946

"The Cabinet Mission and H.E. Viceroy have carefully reviewed the opinions expressed to them by the various representatives they have interviewed and have come to the conclusion that they should make one further attempt to obtain agreement between the Muslim League and Congress.

"They realise that it would be useless to ask the two parties to meet unless were able to place before them a basis of negotiation which could lead to such an agreement.

"I am, therefore, asked to invite the Muslim League to send four negotiators to meet the Cabinet, Mission and the Viceroy together with a similar number from the Congress Working Committee with a view to discussing the possibility of agreement upon a scheme based upon the following fundamental principles:

"The future constitutional structure of British India to be as follows:

"A union government dealing with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications. There will be two groups of provinces, the one of the predominantly Hindu Provinces and other of the pre-dominantly Muslim Provinces, dealing with all other subjects which the provinces in the respective groups desire to be dealt with in common. The Provincial Governments will deal with all other subjects and will have all the residuary sovereign rights."

"It is contemplated that the Indian States will take their appropriate place in this structure on terms to be negotiated with them.

"It would point out that we don't think it either necessary or desirable further to elaborate these principles as all other matters could be dealt with in the course of the negotiations.

"If the Muslim League and Congress are prepared to enter into negotiations on this basis you will perhaps be so good as to let me know the names of the four people appointed to negotiate on their behalf. As soon as I receive these I will let you know the locus of the negotiations which will in all probability be in Simla, where the climate will be more temperate.

The Committee after full discussion requested the President to send a reply to the said letter embodying the views of the Committee and authorised him to nominate representatives to attend the Conference on behalf of the All-India Muslim League.

The President accordingly sent the following letter to Lord Pethick-Lawrence.

Text of letter dated 29th April, 1946

I thank you for your letter of April 27, which I placed before my Working Committee yesterday morning.

My colleagues and I fully appreciate the further attempt

that the Cabinet Mission and H.E. the Viceroy are making to bring about an agreement between the Muslim League and Congress by proposing a meeting of the representatives of the two organisations for the purpose of negotiating an agreement.

They, however, desire me to invite your attention to the position taken up by the Muslim League since the passing of the Lahore resolution in 1940 and successively endorsed by the All-India Muslim League sessions and again by the Convention of Muslim League Legislators, as recently as April 9, 1946, as per copy esclosed.

The Working Committee desire to point out that many important matters, both of principle and detail, in your brief letter, require elucidation and clarification, which, in their opinion, can be achieved at the meeting proposed by you.

Therefore, without prejudice or commitment, the Working Committee, in their anxiety to assist in finding an agreed solution of the Indian constitutional problem, have authorised me to nominate three representatives on behalf of the Muslim League to participate in the negotiations. The following are the four names: Mr M.A. Jinnah, Nawab Mohammad Ismail Khan, Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan and Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar.

116

Statement on the Future Constitution of India issued by the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy, 16 May, 1946

1. On March 15, just before the despatch of the Cabinet Delegation to India, Mr Attlee, the British Prime Minister, used these words:

"My colleagues are going to India with the intention of using their utmost endeavours to help her attain her freedom as speedily and fully as possible. What form of Government is to replace the present regime is for India to decide but our desire is to help her to set up forthwith the machinery for making that decision.

I hope that India and her people may elect to remain within the British Commonwealth. I am certain that they will find great advantages in doing so.

But if she does so elect, it must be by her own free will.

The British Commonwealth and Empire is not bound together by chains of external compulsion. It is a free association of free peoples. If, on the other hand, she elects for independence, in our view she has a right to do so. It will be for us to help to make the transition as smooth and easy as possible."

2. Charged in these historic words we—the Cabinet Ministers and the Viceroy—have done our utmost to assist the two main political parties to reach agreement upon the fundamental issue of the unity or division of India. After prolonged discussions in New Delhi we succeeded in bringing the Congress and the Muslim League together in conference at Simla. There was a full exchange of views and both parties were prepared to make considerable concessions in order to try and reach a settlement but it ultimately proved impossible to close the remainder of the gap between the parties and so no agreement could be concluded. Since no agreement has been reached we feel that it is our duty to put forward what we consider are the best arrangements possible to ensure a speedy setting up of the new constitution. This statement is made with the full approval of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

3. We have accordingly decided that immediate arrangements should be made whereby Indians may decide the future constitution of India and an Interim Government may be set up at once to carry on the administration of British India until such time as a new Constitution can be brought into being. We have endeavoured to be just to the smaller as well as to the larger sections of the people; and to recommend a solution which will lead to a practicable way of governing the India of the future, and will give a sound basis for defence and a good opportunity for progress in the social, political and economic field.

4. It is not intended in this statement to review the voluminous evidence that has been submitted to the Mission; but it is right that we should state that it has shown an almost universal desire, outside the supporters of the Muslim League, for the unity of India.

5. This consideration did not, however, deter us from examining closely and impartially the possibility of a partition of India; since we were greatly impressed by the very genuine and acute anxiety of the Muslims lest they should find themselves subjected to a perpetual Hindu-mojority rule.

This feeling has become so strong and widespread amongst the Muslims that it cannot be allayed by mere paper safeguards.

If there is to be internal peace in India it must be secured by measures which will assure to the Muslims a control in all matters vital to their culture, religion, and economic or other interests.

6. We therefore examined in the first instance the question of a separate and fully independent sovereign state of Pakistan as claimed by the Muslim League. Such a Pakistan would comprise two areas; one in the north-west consisting of the Punjab, Sind, North-West Frontier and British Baluchistan; the other in the north-east consisting of the Provinces of Bengal and Assam. The League were prepared to consider adjustment of boundaries at a later stage, but insisted that the principle of Pakistan should first be acknowledged.

The argument for a separate State of Pakistan was based, first, upon the right of the Muslim majority to decide their method of Government according to their wishes, and secondly, upon the necessity to include substantial areas in which Muslims are in a minority in order to make Pakistan administratively and economically workable.

The size of the non Muslim minorities in a Pakistan comprising the whole of the six Provinces enumerated above would be very considerable as the following figures show:

North-Eastern Area:

	Muslims	Non-Muslims
Punjab	16,217,242	12,201,577
North-West Frontier Province	2,788,797	249,270
Sind	3,208,325	1,326,683
British Baluchistan	438,930	62,701
	22,653,294	13,840,231
	62·07%	37·93%

North-Eastern Area:

	Muslims	Non-Muslims
Bengal	33,005,434	27,301,091
Assam	3,442,479	6,762,254
	36,447,913	34,063,345
	51·69%	48·31%

1. All population figures in this statement are from the most recent census in 1964.

The Muslim minorities in the remainder of British India number some 20 million dispersed amongst a total population of 188 million.

These figures show that the setting up of a separate Sovereign State of Pakistan on the lines claimed by the Muslim League would not solve the communal minority problem.

We see no justification for including within a sovereign Pakistan those districts of the Punjab and Bengal and Assam in which the population is predominantly non-Muslim. Every argument that can be used in favour of Pakistan can equally in our view be used in favour of the exclusion of the non-Muslim areas from Pakistan. This point would particularly affect the position of the Sikhs.

7. We, therefore, considered whether a smaller sovereign Pakistan confined to the Muslim majority areas alone might be a possible basis of compromise. Such a Pakistan is regarded by the Muslim League as quite impracticable because it would entail the exclusion from Pakistan of (*a*) the whole of the Ambala and Jullundur Divisions in the Punjab, (*b*) the whole of Assam except the district of Sylhet; and (*c*) a large part of Western Bengal, including Calcutta, in which city the Muslims form 23·6 per cent of the population. We ourselves are also convinced that any solution which involves a radical partition of the Punjab and Bengal, as this would do, would be contrary to the wishes and interests of a very large proportion of the inhabitants of these Provinces. Bengal and the Punjab each has its common language and a long history and tradition. Moreover any division of the Punjab would of necessity divide the Sikhs leaving substantial bodies of Sikhs on both sides of the boundary. We have, therefore, been forced to the conclusion that neither a larger nor a smaller sovereign State of Pakistan would provide an acceptable solution for the communal problem.

8. Apart from the great force of the foregoing arguments there are weighty administrative, economic and military considerations. The whole of the transportation and postal and telegraph systems of India have been established on the basis of a united India. To disintegrate them would gravely injure both parts of India. The case for a united defence is even stronger. The Indian armed forces have been built up as a whole for the defence of India as a whole, and to break them in two would inflict a deadly blow on the long tradition and high degree of efficiency of the Indian Army and would entail the gravest dangers. The Indian

Navy and Indian Air Force would become much less effective. The two sections of the suggested Pakistan contain the two most vulnerable frontiers in India and for a successful defence in depth the area of Pakistan would be insufficient.

9. A further consideration of importance is the greater difficulty which the Indian States would find in associating themselves with a divided British India.

10. Finally, there is the geographical fact that the two halves of the proposed Pakistan State are separated by some seven hundred miles and the communications between them both in war and peace would be dependent on the goodwill of Hindustan.

11. We are, therefore, unable to advise the British Government that the power which at present resides in British hands should be handed over to two entirely separate sovereign States.

12. This decision does not, however, blind us to the very real Muslim apprehensions that their future and political and social life might become submerged in a purely unitary India, in which the Hindus with their greatly superior numbers must be a dominating element. To meet this, the Congress have put forward a scheme under which Provinces would have full autonomy subject only to a minimum of Central subjects, such as Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications.

Under this scheme Provinces, if they wished to take part in economic and administrative planning on a large scale, could cede to the Centre optional subjects in addition to the compulsory ones mentioned above.

13. Such a scheme would, in our view present considerable constitutional disadvantages and anomalies. It would be very difficult to work a Central Executive and Legislature in which some Ministers, who dealt with compulsory subjects were responsible to the whole of India, while other Ministers, who dealt with optional subjects, would be responsible only to those Provinces which had elected to act together in respect of such subjects. This difficulty would be accentuated in the Central Legislature, where it would be necessary to exclude certain members from speaking and voting when subjects with which their Provinces were not concerned were under discussion.

Apart from the difficulty of working such a scheme we do not consider that it would be fair to deny to other Provinces,

which did not desire to take the optional subjects at the Centre, the right to form themselves into a group for a similar purpose. This would indeed be no more than the exercise of their autonomous powers in a particular way.

14. Before putting forward our recommendations we turn to deal with the relationship of the Indian States to British India. It is quite clear that with the attainment of independence by British India, whether inside or outside the British Commonwealth, the relationship which has hitherto existed between the Rulers of the States and the British Crown will no longer be possible. Paramountcy can neither be retained by the British Crown nor transferred to the new Government.

This fact has been fully recognized by those whom we interviewed from the States. They have at the same time assured us that the States are ready and willing to cooperate in the new development of India. The precise form which their cooperation will take must be a matter for negotiation during the building up of the new constitutional structure and it by no means follows that it will be identical for all the States. We have not, therefore, dealt with the States in the same detail as the Provinces of British India in the paragraphs which follow.

We now indicate the nature of a solution which in our view would be just to the essential claims of all parties and would at the same time be most likely to bring about a stable and practicable form of constitution for all India.

15. We recommend that the constitution should take the following basic form:

(1) There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs; Defence and Communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects.

(2) The Union should have an Executive and a Legislature constituted from British Indian and States representatives. Any question raising a major communal issue in the Legislature, should require for its decision a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities as well as a majority of all the members present and voting.

(3) All subjects other than the Union subjects and all residuary powers should vest in the Provinces.

(4) The States will retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union.

(5) Provinces should be free to form Groups with executives and legislatures, and each Group could determine the Provincial subjects to be taken in common.

(6) The constitution of the Union and of the Groups should contain a provision whereby any Province could, by a majority, vote of its Legislative Assembly call for a reconsideration of the terms of the constitution after an initial period of 10 years and at 10 yearly intervals thereafter.

16. It is not our object to lay out the details of a constitution on the above lines, but to set in motion the machinery whereby a constitution can be settled by Indians for Indians.

It has been necessary, however, for us to make this recommendation as to the broad basis of the future constitution because it became clear to us in the course of our negotiations that not until that had been done was there any hope of getting the two major communities to join in the setting up of the constitution-making machinery.

17. We now indicate the constitution-making machinery which we propose should be brought into being forthwith in order to enable a new constitution to be worked out.

18. In forming any Assembly to decide a new constitutional structure, the first problem is to obtain as broad-based and accurate a representation of the whole population as is possible. The most satisfactory method obviously would be by election based on adult franchise; but any attempt to introduce such a step would lead to a wholly unacceptable delay in the formulation of the new constitution. The only practicable alternative is to utilize the recently elected Provincial Legislative Assemblies as the electing bodies.

There are, however, two factors in their composition which make this difficult. First, the numerical strengths of the Provincial Legislative Assemblies do not bear the same proportion to the total population in each Province. Thus, Assam with a population of 10 millions has a Legislative Assembly of 108 members, while Bengal, with a population six times as large, has an Assembly of only 250. Secondly, owing to the weightage given to minorities by the Communal Award, the strengths of the several communities in each Provincial Legislative

Assembly are not in proportion to their members in the Province. Thus the number of seats reserved for Muslims in the Bengal Legislative Assembly is only 48% of the total, although they form 55% of the Provincial population. After a most careful consideration of the various methods by which these inequalities might be corrected, we have come to the conclusion that the fairest and most practicable plan would be—

(*a*) to allot to each Province a total number of seats proportional to its population, roughly in the ratio of one to a million, as the nearest substitute for representation by adult suffrage;

(*b*) to divide this provincial allocation of seats between the main communities in each Province in proportion to their population:

(*c*) to provide that the representatives allotted to each community in a Province shall be elected by the members of that community in its Legislative Assembly.

We think that for these purposes it is sufficient to recognise only three main communities in India: General, Muslim and Sikh; the "General" community including all persons who are not Muslims or Sikhs. As the smaller minorities would, upon the population basis, have little or no representation since they would lose the weightage which assures them seats in the Provincial Legislatures, we have made the arrangements set out below to give them a full representation upon all matters of special interest to the minorities.

19. (*i*) We, therefore, propose that there shall be elected by each Provincial Legislative Assembly the following numbers of representatives, each part of the Legislature (General, Muslim or Sikh) electing its own representatives by the method or proportional representation with the single transferable vote:

Table of Representation

SECTION A

Province	General	Muslim	Total
Madras	45	4	49
Bombay	19	2	21
United Provinces	47	8	55
Bihar	31	5	36
Central Provinces	16	1	17
Orissa	9	0	9
Total	167	20	187

SECTION B

Province	General	Muslim	Sikh	Total
Punjab	8	16	4	28
N.-W.F.P.	0	3	0	3
Sind	1	3	0	4
Total	9	22	4	35

SECTION C

Province	General	Muslim	Total
Bengal	27	33	60
Assam	7	3	10
Total	34	36	70
Total for British India	..	..	292
Maximum for Indian States	..	..	93
		Total	385

Note.—In order to represent the Chief Commissioners Provinces there will be added to Section A the Member representing

Delhi in the Central Legislative Assembly, the Member representing Ajmer-Nerwara in the Central Legislative Assembly, and a representative to be elected by the Coorg Legislative Council. To Section B will be added a representative of British Baluchistan.

(*ii*) It is the intention that the States should be given in the final Constituent Assembly appropriate representation which would not, on the basis of the calculations adopted for British India, exceed 93, but the method of selection will have to be determined by consultation. The States would in the preliminary stage be represented by a Negotiating Committee.

(*iii*) The representatives thus chosen shall meet at New Delhi as soon as possible.

(*iv*) A preliminary meeting will be held at which the general order of business will be decided, a Chairman and other officers elected, and an Advisory Committee (*see* paragraph 20 below) on the rights of citizens, minorities, and tribal and excluded areas set up. Thereafter, the provincial representatives will divide up into the three sections shown under A, B and C, in the Table of Representation in sub-paragraph (*i*) of this paragraph.

(*v*) These sections shall proceed to settle the Provincial Constitutions for the Provinces included in each section, and shall also decide whether any Group Constitution shall be set up for those Provinces and if so, with what provincial subjects the Group should deal. Provinces shall have the power to opt out of the Groups in accordance with the provisions of sub-clause (*viii*) below.

(*vi*) The representatives of the Sections and the Indian States shall reassemble for the purpose of settling the Union Constitution.

(*vii*) In the Union Constituent Assembly resolutions varying the provisions of paragraph 15 above or raising any major communal issue shall require a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities.

The Chairman of the Assembly shall decide which (if any) of the resolutions raise major communal issues and shall, if so requested by a majority of the representatives of either of the major communi-

ties, consult the Federal Court before giving his decision.

(*viii*) As soon as the new constitutional arrangements have come into operation, it shall be open to any Province to elect to come out of any Group in which it has been placed. Such a decision shall be taken by the new legislature of the Province after the first general election under the new constitution.

20. The Advisory Committee on the rights of citizens, minorities, and tribal and excluded areas should contain full representation of the interests affected, and their function will be to report to the Union Constituent Assembly upon the list of Fundamental, Rights the clauses for the protection of minorities, and a scheme for the administration of the tribal and excluded areas, and to advise whether these rights should be incorporated in the Provincial, Group or Union constitution.

21. His Excellency the Viceroy will forthwith request the Provincial Legislatures to proceed with the election of their representatives and the States to set up a Negotiating Committee. It is hoped that the process of constitution-making can proceed as rapidly as the complexities of the task permit so that the interim period may be as short as possible.

22. It will be necessary to negotiate a Treaty between the Union Constituent Assembly and the United Kingdom to provide for certain matters arising out of the transfer of power.

23. While the constitution-making proceeds, the administration of India has to be carried on. We attach the greatest importance therefore to the setting up at once of an interim Government having the support of the major political parties. It is essential during the interim period that there should be the maximum of cooperation in carrying through the difficult tasks that face the Government of India. Beside the heavy task of day-to-day administration, there is the grave danger of famine to be countered; there are decisions to be taken in many matters of post-war development which will have a far-reaching effect on India's future; and there are important international conferences in which India has to be represented.

For all these purposes a Government having popular support is necessary. The Viceroy has already started discussions to this end, and hopes soon to form an Interim Government in which all the portfolios, including that of War Member, will be

held by Indian leaders having the full confidence of the people. The British Government, recognizing the significance of the changes in the Government of India, will give the fullest measure of cooperation to the Government so formed in the accomplishment of its tasks of administration and in bringing about as rapid and smooth a transition as possible.

24. To the leaders and people of India who now have the opportunity of complete independence we could finally say this. We and our Government and country-men hoped that it would be possible for the Indian people themselves to agree upon the method of framing the new constitution under which they will live. Despite the labours which we have shared with the Indian Parties, and the exercise of much patience and goodwill by all, this has not been possible. We, therefore, now lay before you proposals which, after listening to all sides and after much earnest thought, we trust will enable you to attain your indepedence in the shortest time and with the least danger of internal disturbance and conflict. These proposals may not, of course, completely satisfy all parties, but you will recognize with us that at this supreme moment in Indian history statesmanship demands mutual accommodation.

We ask you to consider the alternative to acceptance of these proposals. After all the effort which we and the Indian Parties have made together for agreement, we must state that in our view there is small hope of peaceful settlement by agreement of the Indian Parties alone. The alternative would, therefore, be a grave danger of violence, chaos, and civil war. The result and duration of such a disturbance cannot be foreseen; but it is certain that it would be a terrible disaster for many millions of men, women and children. This is a possibility which must be regarded with equal abhorrence by the Indian people, our own countrymen, and the world as a whole.

We, therefore, lay these proposals before you in the profound hope that they will be accepted and operated by you in the spirit of accommodation and goodwill in which they are offered. We appeal to all who have the future good of India at heart to extend their vision beyond their own community or interest to the interest of the whole four hundred millions of the Indian people.

We hope that the new independent India may choose to be a member of the British Commonwealth. We hope in any event that you will remain in close and friendly association with our people. But there are matters for your own free choice. Whatever

that choice may be we look forward with you to your ever-increasing prosperity among the great nations of the world, and to a future even more glorious than your past.

117

Quaid-i-Azam's Statement on the Cabinet Mission's Plan for the framing of the Future Constitution of India, Simla, 23 May, 1946

I have now before me the Statement of the British Cabinet Delegation and His Excellency the Viceroy, dated the 15th May, 1946, issued at Delhi. Before I deal with it, I should like to give a background of the discussions that took place at Simla from the 5th of May onwards till the Conference was declared concluded and its breakdown announced in the Official Communique dated 12th May, 1946. We met in the Conference on the 5th May to consider the formula embodied in the letter of the Secretary of State for India dated 27th April, 1946, inviting the League representatives.

The formula was as follows: A Union Government is to deal with the following subjects—Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications. There will be two groups of provinces, one of the predominantly Hindu provinces, and the other of the predominantly Muslim provinces, dealing with all the other subjects which the provinces in the respective groups desire to be dealt with in common. The Provincial Governments will deal with all other subjects and have all the residuary powers and sovereign rights.

The Muslim League's position was that:

Firstly, the zones comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East and the Punjab, N.-W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan in the north-west of India, constitute the Pakistan zones and should be constituted as a sovereign independent state; and that an unequivocal undertaking be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without delay.

Secondly, that separate constitution-making bodies be set up by the peoples of Pakistan and Hindustan for the purpose of framing their respective constitutions.

Thirdly, that minorities in Pakistan and Hindustan be provided with safeguards on the lines of the Lahore Resolution.

Fourthly, that the acceptance of the League demand and its implementation without delay were a *sine qua non* for the League cooperation and participation in the formation of an interim government at the centre.

Fifthly, it gave a warning to the British Government against any attempt to impose a Federal Constitution on a United India basis or forcing any interim arrangement at the centre contrary to the League demand; and that Muslim India would resist if any attempts to impose it were made.

Besides, such an attempt would be the grossest breach of faith of the declaration of His Majesty's Government made in August 1940, with the approval of the British Parliament and subsequent pronouncements by the Secretary of State for India and other responsible British statesmen from time to time reaffirming the August Declaration.

We accepted the invitation to attend the Conference without prejudice and without any commitment and without accepting the fundamental principles underlying this short formula of the Mission on the assurance given by the Secretary of State for India in his letter dated the 29th April, 1946, wherein he said: "We have never contemplated that acceptance by the Muslim League and the Congress of our invitation would imply a as preliminary condition full approval by them of the terms set out in my letter."

These terms are: "Our proposed basis for a settlement and what we have asked the Congress Working Committee to do is to agree to sent its representatives to meet ourselves and representatives of the Muslim League in order to discuss."

The Congress position in reply to the invitation was stated in their letter of April 28, 1946, that a strong Federal Government at the centre with present provinces as federating units be established and they laid down that Foreign Affairs, Defence, Currency, Customs, Tariffs and "such other subjects as may be found on closer scrutiny to be intimately allied to them", should vest in the Central Federal Government.

They negatived the idea of grouping of provinces. They also agreed to participate in the Conference to discuss the formula of the Cabinet Delegation.

After days of discussion no appreciable progress was made. Finally, I was asked to give our minimum terms in writing.

Consequently, we embodied certain fundamental principles of our terms in writing as an offer to the Congress in the earnest desire for a peaceful and amicable settlement and for the speedy attainment of freedom and independence of the peoples of India. It was communicated to the Congress on the 12th May and a copy of it was sent to the Cabinet Mission at the same time.

The following were the terms of the offer:

1. The six Muslim Provinces (Punjab, N.-W.F.P., Baluchistan, Sind, Bengal and Assam) shall be grouped together as one group and will deal with all other subjects and matters except Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications necessary for Defence, which may be dealt with by the constitution-making bodies of the two groups of Provinces—Muslim Provinces (hereinafter named Pakistan Group) and Hindu Provinces—sitting together.

2. There shall be a separate constitution-making body for the six Muslim Provinces named above, which will frame constitution for the Group and the Provinces in the Group and will determine the list of subjects that shall be Provincial and Central (of the Pakistan Federation) with residuary sovereign powers vested in the Provinces.

3. The method of election of the representatives to the constitution-making body will be such as would secure proper representation to the various communities in proportion to their population in each Province of Pakistan Group.

4. After the constitutions of the Pakistan Federal Government and the Provinces are finally framed by the constitution-making body, it will be open to any Province of the Group to decide to opt out of its Group, provided the wishes of the people of that Province are ascertained by a referendum to opt out or not.

5. It must be open to discussion in the joint constitution-making body as to whether the Union will have a Legislature or not. The method of providing the Union with finance should also be left for decision of the joint meeting of the two constitution-making bodies, but in no event shall it be by means of taxation.

6. There should be parity of representation between the two Groups of Provinces in the Union Executive and the Legislature, if any.

7. No major point in the Union Constitution which affects

the communal issue shall be deemed to be passed in the joint constitution-making body, unless the majority of the members of the constitution-making body, of the Hindu Provinces and the majority of the members of the constitution-making body of the Pakistan Group, present and voting, are separately in its favour.

8. No decision, legislative, executive or administrative, shall be taken by the Union in regard to any matter of controversial nature, except by a majority of three-fourths.

9. In Group and Provincial constitutions, fundamental rights and safeguards concerning religion, culture and other matters affecting the different communities will be provided for.

10. The constitution of the Union shall contain a provision whereby any Province can, by a majority vote of its Legislative Assembly, call for reconsideration of the terms of the constitution, and will have the liberty to secede from the Union at any time after an initial period of ten years.

The crux of our offer, as it will appear from its text, was *inter alia* that the six Muslim Provinces should be grouped together as Pakistan Group and the remaining as Hindustan Group and on the basis of two federations we were willing to consider the Union or Confederation strictly confined to three subjects only, namely Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications necessary for defence, which the two sovereign federations would voluntarily delegate to the Confederation.

All the remaining subjects and the residue were to remain vested in the two federations and the provinces respectively. This was intended to provide for a transitional period, as after an initial period of ten years we were free to secede from the Union. But unfortunately this most conciliatory and reasonable offer was in all its fundamentals not accepted by the Congress, as will appear from their reply to our offer.

On the contrary, their initial suggestions were the same as regards the subjects to be vested in the Congress as they had been before the Congress entered the Conference and they made one more drastic suggestion for our acceptance that the centre must also have the power to take remedial action, in cases of breakdown of the constitution and in grave public emergencies. This was stated in their reply dated May 12, 1946, which was communicated to us.

At this stage the Conference broke down and we were informed that the British Cabinet Mission would issue their statement which is now before the public.

To begin, with the statement in cryptic with several lacunas and the operative part of it is comprised of a few short paragraphs to which I shall refer later.

I regret that the Mission should have negatived the Muslim demand for the establishment of a complete Sovereign State of Pakistan, which, we still hold, is the only solution of the constitutional problem of India and which alone can secure stable governments and lead to the happiness and welfare not only of the two major communities, but of all the peoples of this subcontinent.

It is all the more regrettable that the Mission should have thought fit to advance commonplace and exploded arguments against Pakistan and resorted to special pleading couched in a deplorable language which is calculated to hurt the feelings of Muslim India.

It seems that this was done by the Mission simply to appease and placate the Congress, because when they came to face the realities, they themselves made the following pronouncements embodied in paragraph 5 of the Statement, which says:

"This consideration did not, however, deter us from examining closely and impartially the possibility of a partition of India, since we were greatly impressed by the very genuine and acute anxiety of the Muslims lest they should find themselves subjected to a perpetual Hindu-majority rule.

"This feeling has become so strong and widespread amongst the Muslims that it cannot be allayed by mere paper safeguards. If there is to be internal peace in India it must be secured by measures which will assure to the Muslims a control in all matters vital to their culture, religion, and economic or other interests."

And again in paragraph 12:

"This decision does not, however, blind us to the very real Muslim apprehensions that their culture and political and social life might become submerged in a purely unitary India, in which the Hindus with their greatly superior numbers must be a dominating element."

And now what recommendations have they made perceptibly securing the object in view and in the light of very clear and emphatic conclusions they arrived at in paragraph 12 of this Statement?

I shall now deal with some of the important points in the operative part of this Statement:

(1) They have divided Pakistan into two—what they call Section B for the North-Western Zone and Section C for the North-Eastern Zone.

(2) Instead of two constitution-making bodies, only one constitution-making body is devised, that for Sections A, B and C.

(3) They lay down that "there should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects."

There is no indication at all that the Communications would be restricted to what is necessary for defence. Nor is there any indication as to how this Union will be empowered to raise finances required for these three subjects, while our view was that finances should be raised only by contributions and not by taxation.

(4) It is laid down that "The Union should have an Executive and a Legislature constituted from British Indian and States representatives. Any question raising a major communal issue in the Legislature should require for its decision a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities as well as a majority of all the members present and voting."

While our view was: (*a*) That there should be no Legislature for the Union, but the question should be left to the Constituent Assembly to decide; (*b*) that there should be parity of representation between the Pakistan Group and the Hindustan Group in the Union Executive and Legislature, if any; and (c) that no decision, legislative, executive and administrative should be taken by the Union in regard to any matter of controversial nature, except by a majority of three-fourth. All these three terms of our offer have been omitted from the Statement.

Indeed there is one safeguard for the conduct of business in the Union Legislature: that any question raising a major communal issue in the Legislature should require for its decision a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities as well as a majority of all the members present and voting.

Even this is a vague and ineffective. To begin with, who will decide and how as to what is a major communal issue and as to what is a minor communal issue and what is a purely non-communal issue?

(5) Our proposal that the Pakistan Group should have a right to secede from the Union after an initial period of ten years, although the Congress had no serious objection to it, has been omitted and now we are only limited to a reconsideration of terms of the Union Constitution after an initial period of ten years.

(6) Coming to the constitution-making machinery, here again a representative of British Baluchistan is included in Section B, but how he will be elected is not indicated.

(7) With regard to the constitution-making body for the purpose of framing the proposed Union Constitution, it will have an overwhelming Hindu majority. In a House of 292 for British India, the Muslim strength will be 79 and if the number allotted to the Indian States, i.e. 93, is taken into account, it is quite obvious that the Muslim proportion will be further reduced as the bulk of the States representatives would be Hindus.

This Assembly, so constituted, will elect the Chairman and other Officers and, it seems, also the Members of the Advisory Committee referred to in paragraph 20 of the Statement by a majority, and the same rule will apply to other normal business. But I note that there is only one saving clause which runs as follows:

"In the Union Constituent Assembly resolutions varying the provisions of paragraph 15 above or raising any major communal issue shall require a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities.

"The Chairman of the Assembly shall decide which (if any) of the resolutions raise major communal issues and shall, if so requested by a majority of the representatives of either of the major communities, consult the Federal Court before giving his decision."

If follows, therefore, that it will be the Chairman alone who will decide. He will not be bound by the opinion of the Federal Court. Nor need anybody know what that opinion, was, as the Chairman is merely directed to consult the Federal Court.

(8) With regard to the provinces opting out of the Group, it is left to the new Legislature of the Provinces, after the first General Election under the new constitution, to decide instead of a referendum of the people as was suggested by us.

(9) As for paragraph 20, which runs as follows:

"The Advisory Committee on the rights of citizens, minorities, and tribal and excluded areas should contain full representation of the interests affected, and their function will be to report to the Union Constituent Assembly upon the list of Fundamental Rights, the clauses for the protection of minorities, and a scheme for the administration of the tribal and excluded areas, and to advise whether these rights should be incorporated in the Provincial, Group, or Union Constitution."

This raises a very serious question indeed, for if it is left to the Union Constituent Assembly to decide these matters by a majority vote whether any of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee should be incorporated in the Union Constitution, then it will open a door to more subjects being vested in the Union Government. This will destroy the very basic principles that the Union is to be strictly confined to three subjects.

These are some of the main points which I have tried to put before the public after studying this important document. I do not wish to anticipate the decision of the Working Committee and the Council of the All-India Muslim League which are going to meet shortly at Delhi.

They will finally take such decisions as they may think proper after careful consideration of the pros and cons and a thorough and dispassionate examination of the Statement of the British Cabinet Delegation and His Excellency the Viceroy.

118

Cabinet Mission's Supplementary Statement, 25 May, 1946

The Delegation have considered the statement of the President of the Muslim League dated 22nd May and the resolution dated 24th May of the Working Committee of the Congress.

2. The position is that since the Indian leaders, after prolonged discussion, failed to arrive at an agreement, the Delegation put forward their recommendations as the nearest approach to reconciling the views of the two main parties. The scheme stands as a whole and can only succeed if it is accepted and worked in a spirit of cooperation.

3. The Delegation wish also to refer briefly to a few points that have been raised in the statement and resolution.

4. The authority and the functions of the Constituent Assembly, and the procedure which it is intended to follow are clear from the Cabinet Delegation's stagement. Once the Constituent Assembly is formed and working on this basis, there is no intention of interfering with its discretion or questioning its decisions. When the Constituent Assembly has completed its laboures, His Majesty's Government will recommend to Parliament such action as may be necessary for the cession of sovereignty to the Indian people, subject to two matters which are mentioned in the Statement and which we believe are not controversial, namely, adequate provision for the protection of the minorities (paragraph 20 of the Statement) and willingness to conclude a treaty with His Majesty's Government to cover matters arising out of the transfer of power (paragraph 22 of the Statement).

5. It is a consequence of the system of election that a few Europeans can be elected to the Constituent Assembly. Whether the right so given will be exercised is a matter for them to decide.

6. The representative of Baluchistan will be elected in a joint meeting of the Shahi Jirga and the non-official members of the Quetta Municipality.

7. In Coorg the whole Legislative Council will have the right to vote, but the official members will receive instructions not to take part in the election.

8. The interpretation put by the Congress resolution on paragraph 15 of the Statement to the effect that the provinces can in the first instance make the choice whether or not to belong to the section in which they are placed does not accord with the Delegation's intention. The reasons for the grouping of the provinces are well known and this is an essential feature of the scheme and can only be modified by agreement between the parties. The right to opt out of the groups after the constitution-making has been completed will be exercised by the people themselves, since at the first election under the new provincial constitution this question of opting out will obviously be a major issue and all those entitled to vote under the new franchise will be able to take their share in a truly democratic decision.

9. The question of how the States' representatives should be appointed to the Constituent Assembly is clearly one which must be discussed with the States. It is not a matter for decision by the Delegation.

10. It is agreed that the interim Government will have a new basis. That basis is that all portfolios, including that of the War Member, will be held by Indians; and that the members will be selected in consultation with the Indian political parties. These are very significant changes in the Government of India, and a long step towards independence. His Majesty's Government will recognise the effect of these changes, will attach the fullest weight to them, and will give to the Indian Government the greatest possible freedom in the exercise of the day-to-day administration of India.

11. As the Congress statement recognises, the present constitution must continue during the interim period; and the interim Government cannot therefore be made legally responsible to the central legislature. There is, however, nothing to prevent the members of the Government individually or by common consent, from resigning, if they fail to pass an important measure through the legislature, or if a vote of non-confidence is passed against them.

12. There is of course no intention of retaining British troops in India against the wish of an independent India under the new constitution; but during the interim period, which it is hoped will be short, the British Parliament has, under the present constitution, the ultimate responsibility for the security of India and it is necessary therefore that British troops should remain.

119

Virceroy's Statement on formation of Interim Government, 16 June, 1946

1. His Excellency the Viceroy, in consultation with the members of the Cabinet Mission, has for some time been exploring the possibilities of forming a Coalition Government drawn from the two major parities and certain of the minorities. The discussions have revealed the difficulties which exist for the two major parties in arriving at any agreed basis for the formation of such a Government.

2. The Viceroy and the Cabinet Mission appreciate these difficulties and the efforts which the two parties have made to meet them. They consider however that no useful purpose can be served by further prolonging these discussions. It is indeed urgently necessary that a strong and representative Interim Government should be set up to conduct the very heavy and important business that has to be carried through.

3. The Viceroy is therefore issuing invitations to the following to serve as members of the Interim Government, on the basis that the constitution-making will proceed in accordance with the statement of May 16th:

Sardar Baldev Singh,

Sir N.P. Engineer,

Mr Jagjivan Ram,

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,

Mr M. A. Jinnah,

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan,

Mr H. K. Mahtab,

Dr John Matthai,

Nawab Mohammed Ismail Khan,

Khawaja Sir Nazimuddin,

Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar,

Mr C. Rajagopalachari,

Dr Rajendra Prasad,

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel.

If any of those invited is unable for personal reasons to accept, the Viceroy will after consultation invite some other person in his place.

4. The Viceroy will arrange the distribution of portfolios in consultation with the leaders of the two major parties.

5. The above composition of the Interim Government is in no way to be taken as a precedent for the solution of any other communal question. It is an expedient put forward to solve the present difficulty only, and to obtain the best available coalition Government.

6. The Viceroy and the Cabinet Mission believe that Indians of all communities desire to arrive at a speedy settlement of this matter so that the process of constitution-making can go forward and that the Government of India may be carried on as efficiently as possible in the meantime.

7. They therefore hope that all parties especially the two major parties will accept this proposal so as to overcome the present obstacles and will cooperate for the successful carrying on of the Interim Government. Should this proposal be accepted the Viceroy will aim at inaugurating the new Government about the 26th June.

8. In the event of the two major parties or either of them proving unwilling to join in the setting up of a Coalition Government on the above lines, it is the intention of the Viceroy to proceed with the formation of an Interim Government which will be as representative as possible of those willing to accept the statement of May 16.

9. The Viceroy is"also directing the Governors of the Provinces to summon the Provincial Legislative Assemblies forthwith to proceed with the elections necessary for the setting up of the Constitution-making machinery as put forward in the statement of May 16-

120

Correspondence between the Viceroy and Quaid-i-Azam

Letter from the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Avam,
4 June, 1946

You asked me yesterday to give you an assurance about the action that would be taken if one party accepted the scheme

in the Cabinet Delegation's statement of May 16 and the other refused.

I can give you on behalf of the Cabinet Delegation my personal assurance that we do not propose to make any discrimination in the treatment of either party and that we shall go ahead with the plan laid down in the statement so far as circumstances permit if either party accepts, but we hope that both will accept.

I should be grateful if you would see that the existence of this assurance does not become public. If it is necessary for you to tell your Working Committee that you have an assurance, I should be grateful if you would explain to them this condition.

Letter from the Viceroy to the Congress President, 22 June, 1946

My dear Maulana Sahib,—I understand from press reports that there is a strong feeling in the Congress circles that the party should insist on their right to include a Muslim of their own choice among the representatives of the Congress in the interim government.

For reasons, of which you are already aware, it is not possible for the Cabinet Mission or myself to accept this request, but I would draw your attention to paragraph 5 of the statement of June 16, which reads as follows:

"The above composition of the interim government is in no way to be taken as a precedent for the solution of any other communal question. It is an expedient put forward to solve the present difficulty only, and to obtain the best available coalition government."

In the light of this assurance that no precedent is established we appeal to the Congress not to press their demand, but to take part in the strong interim government which the country so urgently needs.

(Sd.) Wavell.

Extracts from Letter from Quaid-i-Azam to the Viceroy, 19 June, 1946

I shall be grateful if you will please make the following points clear with reference to your letter and statement of the 16th June:

1. Whether the proposals contained in the statement for the setting up of an interim government are now final or whether they are still open to any further change or modification at the instance of any of the parties or persons concerned;

2. Whether the total number of 14 members of the government as proposed in the statement would remain unchanged during the interim period;

3. If any person or persons invited as representatives of the four minorities, viz., the Scheduled Castes, the Sikhs, the Indian Christians and the Parsees, is, or are, unable to accept the invitation to join the interim government for personal or other reasons how will the vacancy or vacancies thus created be filled by the Viceroy; and whether in filling up the vacancy or vacancies the leader of the Muslim League will be consulted and his consent obtained;

4. (*a*) Whether during the interim period for which the coalition government is being set up the proportion of members of the government, community-wise, as provided in the proposals, will be maintained;

(*b*) Whether the present representation given to four minorities, viz., the Scheduled Castes, the Sikhs, the Indian Christians and the Parsees will be adhered to without any change or modification; and

5. In view of the substitution of 14 now proposed for the original of 12, and the change made in the original formula, whether there will be a provision, in order to safeguard Muslim interests, that the Executive Council shall not take any decision on any major communal issue if the majority of the Muslim members are opposed to it.

I trust that you will kindly favour me with your reply as early as possible.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Extracts from Letter from the Viceroy to Quaid-i-Azam, 20 June, 1946

On the points which you desire to be made clear in connection with the government to be formed under our statement of June 16, I give you the following reply after consultation with the delegation;

1. Until I have received acceptance from those invited to take office in the interim government, the names in the statement cannot be regarded as final. But no change in principle will be made in the statement without the consent of the two major parties.

(2) No change in the number of 14 members of the interim government will be made without the agreement of the two major parties.

(3) If any vacancy occurs among the seats at present allotted to representatives of minorities, I shall naturally consult both the main parties before filling it.

(4) (*a*) and (*b*), The proportion of members community-wise will not be changed without the agreement of the two major parties.

(5) No decision on a major communal issue could be taken by the interim government if the majority of either of the main parties were opposed to it. I pointed this out to the Congress President and he agreed that the Congress appreciated this point.

121

Resolution on the Cabinet Mission's plan passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 6 June 1946

This meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, after having carefully considered the statement issued by the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy on May 16 and other relevant statements and documents officially issued in connection therewith; and after having examined the proposals set forth in the said statement in all their bearings and implications, places on record the following views for the guidance of the nation and direction to the Working Committee.

That the references made and the conclusions recorded in paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the statement concerning the Muslim demand for the establishment of a full sovereign Pakistan as the only solution of the Indian constitutional problem are unwarranted, unjustified and unconvincing and should not, therefore, have found place in a State document issued on behalf and with the authority of the British Government.

These paragraphs are couched in such language and contain such mutilation of established facts that the Cabinet Mission have clearly been prompted to include them in their statement solely with the object of appeasing the Hindus in utter disregard of Muslim sentiments. Furthermore, the contents of the aforesaid paragraphs are in conflict and inconsistent with the admissions made by the members of the Mission themselves in paragraphs 5 and 12 of their statement, which are to the following effect:

Firstly, the Mission "were greatly impressed by the very genuine and acute anxiety of the Muslims, lest they should find themselves subjected to a perpetual Hindu majority rule;"

Secondly, "this feeling has become so strong and widespread amongst the Muslims that it cannot be allayed by mere paper safeguards;"

Thirdly, "If there is to be internal peace in India, it must be secured by measures, which will assure to the Muslims a control in all matters vital to their culture, religion, economic or other interests;" and

Fourthly, very real Muslim apprehensions exist that "their culture and political and social life might become submerged in a purely unitary India in which Hindus, with their greatly superior numbers, must be a dominating element."

In order that there may be no manner of doubt in any quarter, the Council of the All-India Muslim League reiterates that the attainment of the goal of complete sovereign Pakistan still remains the unalterable objective of the Muslims of India, for the achievement of which they will, if necessary, employ every means in their power and consider no sacrifice or suffering too great.

That notwithstanding the affront offered to Muslim sentiments by a choice of injudicious words in the preamble of the statement of the Cabinet Mission, the Muslim League, having regard to the grave issues involved, and prompted by its earnest desire for a peaceful solution, if possible, of the Indian constitutional problem, and inasmuch as the basis and the foundation of Pakistan are inherent in the Mission's Pıan by virture of the compulsory grouping of the six Muslim provinces in Sections B and C, is willing to co-operate with the constitution-making machinery proposed in the scheme outlined by the Mission, in the hope that it would ultimately result in the establishment

of a complete sovereign Pakistan and in the concummation of the goal of indepcndence for the major nations, and all the other peoples inhabiting this vast sub-continent.

It is for these reasons that the Muslim League is accepting the scheme and will joint the constitution-making body and will keep in view the opportunity and the right of secession of provinces or groups from the Unionw which have been provided in the Mission's plan by implication.

The ultimate attitude of the Muslim League will depend on the final outcome of the labours of the constitution-making body and on the final shape of the constitutions, which may emerge from the deliberations of that body jointly and separately in its three sections.

The Muslim League also reserves the right to modify and revise the policy and attitude set forth in this resolution at any time during the progress of deliberations of the constitution-making body or the Constituent Assembly or, thereafter, if the course of events so require, bearing in mind the fundamental principles and ideals hereinbefore adumbrated to which the Muslim League is irrevocably committed.

That with regard to the arrangements for the proposed interim government at the Centre, this Council authorises its President to negotiate with the Viceroy and to take such decisions and actions as he deems fit and proper.

122

Statementon the Postponement of Formation of Interim Government issued by the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy, 26 June, 1946

The Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy are glad that constitution-making can now proceed with the consent of the two major parties and of the States. They welcome the statements made to them by the leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League that it is their intention to try and work in the Constituent Assembly so as to make it an effective means of devising the new constitutional arrangements under which India can achieve her independence. They are sure that the members of the Constituent Assembly, who are about to be elected, will work in this spirit.

The Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy regret that it has not so far proved possible to form an interim coalition government, but they are determined that the effort should be renewed in accordance with the terms of paragraph 8 of their statement of June 16.

Owing, however, to the very heavy burden which has been cast upon the Viceroy and the representatives of the parties during the last three months, it is proposed that further negotiations should be adjourned for a short interval—during the time while the elections for the Constituent Assembly will be taking place.

It is hoped that when the discussions are resumed the leaders of the two major parties, who have all expressed their agreement with the Viceroy and the Mission of the need for the speedy formation of a representative interim government, will do their utmost to arrive at an accommodation upon the composition of that government.

As the Government of India must be carried on until a new interim government can be formed, it is the intention of the Viceroy to set up a temporary caretaker government of officials.

It is not possible for the Cabinet Mission to remain longer in India, as they must return to report to the British Cabinet and Parliament and also to resume their work, from which they have been absent for over three months. They, therefore, propose to leave India on Saturday next, June 29.

In leaving India, the members of the Cabinet Mission express their cordial thanks for all the courtesy and consideration which they have received as guests in the country, and they most sincerely trust that the steps which have been initiated will lead to a speedy realisation of the hopes and wishes of the Indian people.

123

Quaid-i-Azam's Statement reviewing the Whole Situation relating to the Cabinet Mission's Plan and Postponement of Formation of Interim Goverment, 27 June, 1946

I have considered the letter of the Congress President addressed to Lord Wavell dated June 25, the resolution of the

Working Committee of the Congress released to the press yester day; and the statement of the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy issued in New Delhi on Wednesday, June 26, but a copy of which has not yet been furnished to me.

I think it is necessary for me to state shortly as to what occurred during the progress of the negotiations at various stages from time to time.

Prior to the Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16, and further statement of May 25, the Viceroy at Simla represented to me that he would proceed with the formation of an interim government on the basis of the formula 5 : 2 : i. e. 5 on behalf of the Muslim League, 5 on behalf of the Congress, one Sikh and one Indian Christian or Anglo-Indian and that, as regards the portfolios, the most important of them would be equally divided between the Congress and the Muslim League, further details being left open for discussion.

With the permission of the Viceroy I was authorised to state this fromula to the Working Committee at Simla, on the assumption that the long-term proposals would be such as would be acceptable to us. Thereafter again, on the eve of the meeting of the Working Committee of the Muslim League, in my interview on June 3, the Viceroy repeated the same formula and authorised me to convey it to my Working Committee.

This was one of the most important consideration which weighed with them together with the two statements of the Cabinet Delegat on dated May 16 and 25. The long-term plan and the interim government formula together formed one whole and this formula regarding the interim government was an integral part of the whole scheme and as such the Council of the All-India Muslim League gave its final decision on that basis on June 6.

Therefore, the Viceroy sent for me on June 13 and he suggested a formula of 5:5:3. Owing to the agitation set on foot by the Congress press and the opposition of the Congress to the original formula, I had already given a warning to the Viceroy in a letter on June 2, that any departure from this formula, directly or indirectly, would lead to serious consequences and would not secure the cooperation of the Muslim League and that I might have to call a meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League again.

At my interview with the Viceroy on June 13, I was told by

him that he wanted to change the basis of the original formula and proceed on the basis of five Congress, five Muslim League and three others. i.e. one Sikh, one Scheduled Caste and one Indian Christian or Anglo-Indian. In spite of the difficulties that I had pointed out would arise, I informed the Viceroy that if the Congress were finally to agree to this new formula I would place it before my Working Committee for their consideration.

But even this second proposal of the Viceroy was turned down by the Congress and His Excellency the Viceroy informed me by his letter dated June 15 that he had failed to negotiate an agreement on the basis which he has suggested and that the Cabinet Delegation and he had decided to issue their statement on June 16 on the action they proposed to take.

Accordingly, the statement of June 16 was issued to the press and an advance copy was sent to me. The terms were, we were categorically informed, final and not open to any modification, except that the names in the statement could not be regarded as final, until the Viceroy had received acceptances from those invited to take office in the interim government.

On June 19, I wrote to the Viceroy seeking certain clarifications regarding the statement of June 16, to which a reply was received from him on June 20 after he had consulted the Cabinet Delegation. The following extracts are from that letter of the Viceroy in reply to questions put to him:

(1) "Until I have received the acceptance of those invited to take office in the interim government, the names in the statement cannot be regarded as final. No change is proposed to be made in the statement without the consent of the two major parties.

(2) "No change in the number of 14 members of the interim government will be made without agreement of the two major parties.

(3) "If any vacancy occurs among the seats at present allotted to the representatives of the minorities, I shall naturally consult both the main parties for filling it

(4) "The proportion of the members by 'communities' will not be changed without agreement of the two major parties.

(5) "No decision on a major communal issue could be taken by the interim government if the majority of the main parties were opposed to it. I pointed this out to the

Congress President and he agreed that the Congress appreciated this point."

I had by my letter of June 19 informed the Viceroy that in view of the serious changes which had from time to time been made to satisfy the Congress, it was not possible for the Working Committee to arrive at any decision in the matter of formation of the interim government, so long as the Congress did not convey their final decision on the proposals of June 16 to the Viceroy and until it was communicated to me.

It was finally arranged that the Congress should give their decision by Sunday, June 23, and the League should give its decision on the same day or immediately thereafter. The reply of the Congress was, however, not forthcoming till late in the evening on June 25, and I was asked to meet the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy the same evening. There I was furnished with a copy of the letter of the President of the Congress dated June 25.

According to the arrangement referred to above I placed this reply before my Working Committee immediately and the same day the Muslim League Working Committee adopted the following resolution which was communicated to His Excellency the Viceroy the same night:

"The President of the All-India Muslim League placed before the Working Committee, a copy furnished to him by the Viceroy and the Cabinet Delegation in the course of their interview with him this evening, of the letter of the Congress President addressed to the Viceroy, conveying the decision of the Congress with regard to the proposals of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy contained in their statement of May 16, and June 1946.

"According to the understanding that the Muslim League Working Committee will give their decision after the Congress has decided, and, as desired by the Viceroy by the letter of his Private Secrtary dated June 21 addressed to the Honorary Secretary of the All-India Muslim League, Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, that the decisions of the Muslim League be communicated immediately after the reply of the Congress, the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League hereby resolve to agree to join the interim government on the basis of the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and His Excellency the Viceroy dated June 16, 1946 and the clarification and assurances given by the Viceroy after consultation with the Cabinet Delegation in his letter dated June 20, 1946, addressed to the President of the President of the Muslim League.

"The Working Committee cannot accept the contention of the Congress contained in the aforesaid letter that the Congress is entitled to adhere to its interpretation of some of the provisions in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and His Excellency the Viceroy dated My 16, 1946, which is opposed to the interpretation and explanation embodied in the statement issued by the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy on May 25, 1946.

"With regard to the rest of the letter of the Congress President, the Working Committee reserve their observation for the present."

I regret that the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy should have thought fit to postpone indefinitely the formation of the interim government on the basis of their statement of June 16 as that statement clearly says that the Viceroy aimed at inaueguerating the interim government about 26. It is verey difficult to see what are the mysterious reasons and causes for this sudden departure.

The Muslim League emphatically disapproves of this action on the part of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy, because all contingencies including rejection by the Congress contemplated by and provided for in the statement of June 16 and clause 8 of the statement, taken along with the context, is quite clear and the delegation and the Viceroy were in honour bound to go ahead with the formation of the interim government immediately with those who were willing to come into the interim government on the basis and principles set out in their statement of June 16.

As regards the resolution of the Congress I most emphatically repudiate their bogus claim that they represent India and their claim to "national" character. The Congress are a Hindu organisation and they do not represent any other community except the Caste Hindus. Their certainly do not represent the Muslims and the mere fact that they have a handful of Muslim benchmen for the purpose of window-dressing cannot give the national character which they claim, nor the right to represent India upon which they keep on harping.

This has been established beyond doubt in the recent elections the results of which show that the Muslim League carried away 90 per cent of the total of Muslim seats in the various legislatures, and out of the remaining 10 per cent the Congress share does not amount to more than 4 per cent.

The Congress, therefore, have no right to represent or speak on behalf of the Muslims and their refusal to accept the proposals for the formation of the interim govenment is based on sinister motives. Firstly, they wanted to break the parity between the Muslims and the Caste Hindus. It was accepted by them at Simla last year at the conference called by the Viceroy in connection with the Wavell proposals, and secondly, their insistence on nominating a Congress Muslim is aimed at striking at the fundamentals of the League and its Muslim national representative character and at attempting to establish a false claim that the Congress represents the Muslims and the Muslim League is not the representative organisation of Muslim India.

As it is pointed out above, the Congress claim is not true nor based upon facts and therefore the Muslim League cannot be a party directly or indirectly to any course of action which is calculated to prop up this bogus claim.

As regards the safeguard that no decision on any major communal issue could be taken if the majority of the main parties were opposed to it, of which assurance was given by the Viceroy, I say this is absolutely necessary to protect the Muslim interests as the number is now increased from 12 to 14, and although there is parity between the Caste Hindus and the Muslims, the Muslims will be in a minority of little over one-third in the whole executive.

I gather from the letter of the President of the Congress that the Viceroy represented to him that in his proposal there was no parity either between Hindus and Muslims or between the Congress and the Muslim League inasmuch as there were to be six Hindus belonging to the Congress as against five Muslims belonging to the Muslim League. One of the six Hindus belonged to the Scheduled Caste.

Whether this version is true or not, it is contrary to what the Viceroy said in his letter of June 20 to me which clarifies the points raised by me and in that he says: "The proportion of members by communities will not be changed without the agreement of the two major parties." However, I want to make it clear that if there is any departure made in the principle of parity or if the Congress is allowed to nominate a Muslim, in either case it will be impossible for the Muslim League to agree to it as that would strike at the very fundamentals of the League.

Notwithstanding the clear statement of May 16 and the further statement of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy of

May 25, clarifying and finally giving their authoritative interpretation, the Congress both in the letier of the President and their resolution adhere to their wrong interpretation that any province or provinces is or are entitled to opt out initially and that have a right at any stage to do so.

This is a clear indication that the Congress is not accepting the long-term proposals in a sincere and honest spirit of co-operation and peaceful settlement. If they persist in this and adopt measures to set at nought what is described by the statement of the delegation of May 25, to constitute the essential feature of the scheme the whole plan will be wrecked at its very inception.

As regards the many other statements and allegations that are made in the letter of the Congress President, they are merely intended to propaganda and some of them are not relevant to the immediate issues, but I have no means of dealing with them as I do not know what actually took place between the Congress President and the Viceroy or the delegation as I have not got the correspondence that passed between them on various points to which references have been made in this letter.

In conclusion I would like to emphasise that if any attempt is made to whittle down in any way the assurances given to the Muslim League or to change or modify the basis of the statement of June 16, which has been accepted by the Muslim League, it will be regarded by Muslim India as going back on the part of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy on their pledged word in writing and as a breach of faith. The British Government will in that case forfeit the confidence of Muslim India and of those whom they expect to work on their part, according to their pledged word.

124

Editorial of Statesman on Postponement of Formation of Interim Government, 29 June, 1946

We record, with regret, that we consider the British Cabinet Mission's and the Viceroy's latest move an error. It is well intentioned. If detached from its chronological sequence and context it might, to meet the existing position, be a suitable enough expedient. Indeed, so viewed, it even shows advantageous possibilities of a transient sort; for plainly, Congress-League disagreement being what they still unfortunately are, a League-dominated Central Government, in relation to Congress-dominated

Provincial Governments might not prove much of a remedy for India's many present administrative ills. But it cannot be so detached. The context exists, plain and recent, for all to read. On June 16, in paragraph (8) of their statement, the Mission and the Viceroy declared that "in the event of the two major parties, or either of them, proving unwilling to join in the setting up of a coalition government on the above lines, it is the intention of the Viceroy to proceed with the formation of the interim government which will be as representative as possible of those willing to accept the statement of May 16."

This declaration's direct bearing on the existing position is unmistakable, unavoidable. The Muslim League having on June 6 accepted the proposals made for an interim government in the May 16 plan, and having reiterated its acceptance lately, the Congress by contrast having rejected them, we fail to see any other conclusion than that the Viceroy stood morally bound at this stage to form forthwith an interim government consisting largely of members of the Muslim League. There had been several earlier authoritative assertions of India's imperative need, because of the threat of famine and other grave administrative problems, for speedy establishment of a representative interim government at the Centre. The language of the passing reference now made, in Wednesday night's announcement by Mission and Viceroy, to paragraph (8) of their June 16 declaration and its clear commitment seems to us, we are sorry to say, evasive and disingenuous.

Politicians may do so, but it is not the business of statesman to eat their words; they should not risk bold, sweeping, unequivocal public undertakings unless they mean them, and can be relied upon to fulfil them. Particularly, we suggest, it is not British statesmen's business to do so in India, an alien land still of semi-dependent status. What was so emphatically considered needfuland proper on June 16 cannot well, within ten days, have radically transformed its nature. Good and bad, necessary and unnecessary, are not thus readily interchangeable.

Our writing, we think, have shown lively and wholehearted awareness of the unparalleled difficulties confronting the Mission and the Viceroy throughout, of their exemplary patience, of the exceptional mental and physical stresses that they must lately have borne. Could we believe that what they have now done has sound moral basis, or even that, in the narrower sense, it was required because it would be justified by results, we might commend it. But we view the long-term consequences of Wednesday night's decision with uncertainty and misgiving. Opportunity

of solid and immediate cooperation, from at any rate one of India's two main parties, lay within the Mission's grasp. This has been let slip in favour of larger objectives later aimed at. We wish we could see more cause for confidence that these will not, when the time comes, dissolve between the fingers into windy nothingness. During the long-drawn out Delhi-Simla negotiations there have already been too many tactical shifts of ground and changes of front by others. It grieves us that a venerable and idealistic Secretary of State, a fine Viceroy, and their two eminent colleagues of Britain's new and good Cabinet should at this last stage have descended—as we see matters—to similar swithery courses.

125

Resolution on Withdrawal of Acceptance of Cabinet Mission's Plan passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 28 July, 1946

On the 6th of June 1946, the Council of the All-India Muslim League accepted the scheme embodied in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy dated 16th May, 1946, and explained by them in their statement dated 25th May, 1946. The scheme of the Cabinet Delegation fell far short of the demand of the Muslim nation for the immediate establishment of an independent and fully sovereign State of Pakistan comprising the six Muslim provinces but the Council accepted a union centre for ten years strictly confined to three subjects, viz., defence, foreign affairs and communications since the scheme laid down certain fundamentals and safeguards and provided for the grouping separately of the six Muslim provinces in Sections B and C for the purpose of framing their provincial and groupconstitutions unfettered by the union in any way, and also with a view to ending the Hindu-Muslim deadlock peacefully and accelerate the attainment of freedom of the people of India.

In arriving at this decision, the Council was also greatly influenced by the statement of the President, which he made with the authority of the Viceroy, that the interim government, which was an integral part of the Mission's scheme, was going to be formed on the basis of a formula viz., five Muslim League, five Congress, one Sikh and one Indian Christian or Anglo-Indian and the most important portfolios to be distributed equally between the major parties, the Muslim League and the

Congress. The Council authorised their President to take such decision and action with regard to further details of setting up the interim government as he deemed fit and proper. In that very resolution the Council also reserved the right to modify and revise this policy, if the course of events so required.

The British Government have comitted a breach of faith with the Muslim League in that the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy went back on the original formula of 5 : 5 : 2 for setting up of the interim government to placate the Congress.

The Viceroy, having gone back on the original formula upon the basis of which the Muslim Council came to their decision on the 6th of June, suggested a new basis of 5 : 5 : 3 and after carrying on considerable negotiations with the Congress and having failed to get the Congress to agree intimated to the parties on the 15th June that he and the Cabinet Delegation would issue their final statement with regard to the setting up of the interim government.

Accordingly on the 16th of Junet he President of the Muslim League received a statement embodying what was announced to be the final decision for setting up the interim government by the Viceroy making it clear that if either of the two major parties refused to accept the statement of June 15 the Viceroy would proceed to form the interim government with the major parties accepting it and such other representatives as were willing to join. This was explicitly laid down in the paragraph 8 of the statement of June 16.

Even this final decision of the Cabinet Mission of the 16th of June with regard to the formation of the interim government was rejected by the Congress whereas the Muslim League definitely accepted it although it was different from the original formula, i.e. 5: 5: 2,—because the Viceroy provided safeguards and gave other assurances which are in his letter dated the 20th of June, 1946.

The Viceroy, however, scrapped the proposal of the 16th of June and postponed the formation of the interim government on the plea concocted by the legalising talents of the Cabinet Mission putting a most fantastic and dishonest construction upon paragraph 8 of the statement to the effect that as both the major parties, i.e. the Muslim League and the Congress had accepted the statement of May 16 the question of the interim government could only be taken up in consultation with the representatives of both the parties *de novo*.

Even assuming that this construction was tenable, for which there is no warrant, the Congress, by their conditional acceptanee with reservations and interpretations of their own as laid down in the letter of the ex-President of the Congress dated the 25th of June and the resolution of the Working Committee of the Congress passed at Delhi on the 26th of June, repudiating the very fundamentals of the scheme, had, in fact, rejected the statement of the 16th of May and, therefore, in no event there was any justification whatsoever for abandoning the final proposals of the 16th June.

As regards the proposal embodied in the statements of the 16th and 20th of May of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy, the Muslim League alone of the two major parties had accepted it.

The Congress have not accepted it because their acceptance is conditional and subject to their own interpretations which is contrary to the authoritative statements of the delegation and the Viceroy issued on the 16th and the 25th of May. The Congress have made it clear that they do not accept any of the terms of the fundamentals of the scheme, but that they have agreed only to go into the Constituent Assembly and to nothing else and that Constituent Assembly is a sovereign body and can take such decisions as it may think proper in total disregard of the terms and the basis on which it is to be set up. Subsequently they made this further clear beyond doubt in the speeches that were made at the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay on the 6th of July by prominent members of the Congress and in the statement of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President of the Congress, to a press conference on 10th July in Bombay and then again even after the debate in Parliament in a public speech by him at Delhi on the 22nd of July.

The result is that, of the two major parties, the Muslim League alone has accepted the statement of May 16th and 25th according to the spirit and letter of the proposals embodied therein, and in spite of the attention of the Secretary of State for India having been drawn to this situation by the statement of the President of the Muslim League of the 13th July from Hyderabad, Deccan, neither Sir Stafford Cripps in the House of Commons, nor Lord Pethick-Lawrence in the House of Lords in the course of the recent debate have provided or suggested any means or machinery to prevent the Constituent Assembly from taking decisions which would be *ultra vires* and not competent for the Assembly to take. The only reply to this matter

that the Secretary of State gave was mere expression of pious hope and said: "That would not be fair to the other parties who go in?"

Once the Constituent Assembly has been summoned and met, there is no provision or power that could prevent any decision from being taken by the Congress with its overwhelming majority, which would not be competent for the Assembly to take or which would be *ultra vires* of it and however repugnant it might be to the letter or the spirit of the scheme. It would rest entirely with the majority to take such decisions as they may think proper or suit them and the Congress has already secured by sheer number an over-whelming Hindu Caste majority and they will be in a position to use the Assembly in the manner in which they have already declared, i.e. that they will wreck the basic form of the grouping of the provinces and extend the scope, powers and subjects of the Union Centre which is confined strictly to three specific subjects as laid down in paragraph 15 and provided for in paragraph 19 of the statement of 16th May.

The Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy collectively and individually, have stated several times that the basic principles were laid down to enable the major parties to join the Constituent Assembly and that the scheme cannot succeed unless it is worked in a spirit of cooperation. The attitude of the Congress clearly shows that these conditions precedent for the successful working of the constitution-making do not exist. This fact, taken together with the policy of the British Government of sacrificing the interests of the Muslim nation and some other weaker sections of the peoples of India, particularly the Scheduled Castes, to appease the Congress and the way in which they have been going back on their oral and written solemn pledges and assurances given from time to time to the Muslims, leave no doubt that in these circumstances the participation of the Muslims in the proposed constitution-making machinery is fraught with danger and the Council, therefore, hereby withdaws its acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's proposals which was communicated to the Secretary of the State for India by the President of the Muslim League on 6th of June, 1946.

126

Resolution on Direct Action passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 29 July, 1946

Whereas the All-India Muslim League has today resolved to reject proposals embodied in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and the Viceroy dated May 16, 1946, due to the intransigence of the Congress on the one hand the breach of faith with the Muslims by the British Government on the other;

And whereas Muslim India has exhausted without success all efforts to find a peaceful solution of the Indian problem by compromise and constitutional means; and whereas the Congress is bent upon setting up a Caste Hindu Raj in India with the connivance of the British; and whereas recent events have shown that power politics and not justice and fair-play are deciding factors in Indian affairs;

And whereas it has become abundantly clear that the Muslims of India would not rest content with anything less than the immediate establishment of an independent and full sovereign State of Pakistan and would resist any attempt to impose any constitution, long-term or short-term, or setting up of any interim government at the Contre without the approval and consent of the Muslim League, the Council of the All-India Muslim League is convinced that now the time has come for the Muslim nation to resort to direct action to achieve Pakistan and to get rid of the present slavery under the British and contemplated future Caste Hindu domination.

This Council calls upon the Muslim nation to stand to a man behind their sole representative organisation—the All-India Muslim League and be ready for every sacrifice.

This Council directs the Working Committee to prepare forthwith a programme of direct action to carry out the policy initiated above and to organise the Muslims for the coming struggle to be launched as and when necessary.

As a protest against and in token of their deep resentment of the attitude of the British, this Council calls upon the Mussalmans to renounce forthwith the titles conferred upon them by the Alien Government.

127

Correspondence on Formation of Interim Government between the Viceroy and the Quaid-i-Azam, July-August 1946

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr Jinnah, 22 July, 1946

I declare my intention of replacing the present caretaker Government of officials by an Interm Coalition Government as soon as possible, and am now putting to you as President of the Muslim League and to the President of the Congress the proposals set out below.

(2) I think you will probably agree with me that our negotiations, both this summer and last year, were hampered by the attendant publicity. I am, therefore, seeking your cooperation in conducting, at any rate, the preliminary stages of the negotiations on a strictly personal and secret basis between myself and the two Presidents. I very much hope that you will prevent this correspondence being known to or discussed in the press until we have seen whether we can find some basis of agreement. I realize, of course, that you will have, at some stage, to secure the approval of your Working Committee; but I believe it will be best to try and reach some basis of agreement between ourselves as a first step. I propose the following for your consideration:

(*a*) The Interim Government will consist of fourteen members.

(*b*) Six members (to include one Scheduled Caste representative) will be nominated by the Congress. Five members will be nominated by the Muslim League. Three representatives of minorities will be nominated by the Viceroy. One of these places will be kept for a Sikh. It will not be open to either Congress or the Muslim League to object to the names submitted by the other party, provided they are accepted by the Viceroy.

(*c*) Distribution of portfolios will be decided after the parties have agreed to enter the Government and have submitted their names. The Congress and the Muslim League will each have an equitable share of the most important portfolios.

(*d*) The assurance about the status of the Interim Government which I gave in my letter, dated 30th May, to Maulana Azad will stand.

(3) I would welcome a convention, if freely offered by the Congress, that major communal issues can only be decided by the assent of both the major parties. But I have never thought that it was essential to make this a formal condition since, in fact, a Coalition Government could work on no other basis.

(4) I sincerely trust that your party will agree to cooperate in the administration of India on the above basis, while the work of constitution-making proceeds. I am confident that this will be of the greatest possible benefit to India. I suggest that we should not spend further time in negotiation, but should try out at once a Government on the basis proposed above. If it does not work, and you find the conditions unsatisfactory, it will be open to you to withdraw, but I am confident that you will not.

(5) Would you be good enough to let me know very soon whether Muslim League will enter in the Interim Government on this basis? I have written in similar terms to Pandit Nehru and enclose a copy of my letter to him.

Letter form Mr Jinnah to Lord Wavell, 31 July, 1946

I am in receipt of your letter of 22nd July and I notice that this is the fourth basis that you are suggesting for the formation of your Interim Government. From 5 : 5 : 2 you came to 5 : 5 : 3 and then 5:5:4 as embodied in the statement of the Cabinet Delegation and yourself dated 16th June, 1946, which was announced by you as final. Now you are making this fourth proposal, i.e. 6 : 5 : 3.

Every time the Congress turned down the previous three proposals as you were unable to appease them or propitiate them; and every time the departure was prejudicial to the League and in favour of the Congress.

And now you have put your fourth proposal for my consideration.

It gives a go-by to all the important terms which were in favour of the Muslim League; the Congress will have six members out of fourteen as against five members of the Muslim League which breaks straightway the principle of parity; and you are letting down the Scheduled Castes as one of them is proposed to be nominated by the Congress and not by the real spokesmen of the Scheduled Castes. I note that you say that five members will be nominated by the Muslim League. Next, three members from the minorities will be nominated by the Viceroy without reference to or consultation with the Muslim League.

The only indication that you have given is that one of these places will be kept for a Sikh.

Then you proceed to say that "it will not be open either to the Congress or the Muslim League to object to names submitted by the other party, provided they are accepted by the Viceroy," and from this I gather that it will be open to the Congress to nominate a quisling Muslim.

As to the distribution of portfolios, I note you say that "the Congress and the Muslim League will have an equitable share of the most important portfolios," and not equal as it was originally proposed.

As to the assurance about safeguards, i.e. that a major communal issue could only be decided by the consent of both the major parties, you say that "it will be only considered if freely offered by the Congress," but you do not attach much importance to it and you conclude by say that if the Interim Government does not work when formed on this basis and if we find conditions unsatisfactory, it will be open to us to withdraw. I believe in the principle, "Prevention is better than cure".

This is a very clear and substantial departure, most detrimental to the Muslim League, and is obviously intended to appease the Congress and devised primarily to meet their wishes.

Taking the final proposal of 16th June, 1946, in your letter dated 20th June, you informed me that fourteen members were invited by you on the basis of parity between Hindus and Muslims and community-wise and that it will not be changed without the agreement of the two major parties. Apart from the secret talks you had with the Congress, you clearly conveyed to us that the invitees were asked to join specifically on the basis of five Hindus, five Muslims, one Sikh, one Scheduled Caste, one Christian and one Parsee. Your present proposal clearly destroys the principle of parity as well as representation according to communities and gives a clear majority to the Congress as against the Muslim League to start with.

Further the Scheduled Caste will be nominated by the Congress, which in my opinion is most unjust to a community of 60 million people, who are groaning under the social and economic tyranny of the high Caste Hindus, whom alone the Congress really represents.

As regards representatives of other minorities, they will be nominated by you without reference to or any consultation with

the Muslim League. This again is a departure from what you stated in your letter of 20th June, that "if any vacancy occurs among the seats at present allotted to the representatives of the minorities, I shall naturally consult both the major parties before filling it". I think you will appreciate that when you start with six Congress and five Muslim League with a Congress majority, the minority representatives will hold a very strong position as a balancing element, who would be nominated by you without having even consultation with the Muslim League, and this is a serious departure from what we were assured of in your letter of 20th June.

You categorically state in your letter of 20th June, paragraph 5, that "no decision on a major communal issue would be taken by the Interim Government if majority of the representatives of either of the two major parties were opposed to it", whereas now in the present proposals you inform me that you will welcome a convention if freely offered by the Congress.

As you have written this letter to me and it is strictly personal and secret I can only say that in my opinion there is no chance of my Working Committee accepting this proposal.

Letter from Lord Wavell to Mr Jinnah, 8 August 1946

I have received your letter of 31st July about my proposal for an Interim Government.

I am sorry that things have gone the way they have, but I do not think it will be profitable now to enter into a detailed discussion of the points you raise in your letter. I will only remind you that the basis of representation which I suggested in the letter to which you now reply is the same as the one of the Muslim League Working Committee accepted at the end of June, namely, 6 : 5 : 3.

In view of the League resolution of 29th July, I have now decided to invite the Congress to make proposals for an Interim Government, and I am sure that if they make a reasonable offer to you of a coalition, I can rely on you for a ready response. I have told the President of the Congress that any Interim Government would be on the basis of the assurances given in my letter of 30th May to Maulana Azad.

I hope we may have an opportunity of meeting soon.

128

Correspondence on Interim Government between Quaid-i-Azam and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, August 1946

Letter from Pandit Nehru, Wardha, August 13

Dear Mr Jinnah,

As you know, the Viceroy has invited me in my capacity as President of the Congress, to make proposals for the immediate formation of the Interim Government. I have accepted the invitation. I feel that my first step should be to approach you and seek your cooperation in the formation of a coalition provisional government. It is naturally our desire to have as representative a government as possible. Should you wish to discuss this matter further with me, before coming to a decision, I shall gladly see you in Bombay or wherever you may be. I am leaving Wardha on the 14th and reaching Bombay on the 15th August forenoon. Probably I shall leave Bombay for Delhi on the morning of August 17.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

Reply from Mr Jinnah, dated Bombay, August 15

Dear Pandit Jawaharal Nehru,

I received your letter, dated the 13th, yesterday, delivered to my by hand.

I know nothing as to what has transpired between the Viceroy and you; nor have I any idea of what agreement has been arrived at between you two, except what you say in your letter that the Viceroy has invited you, in your capacity as the President of the Congress, to make proposals for the immediate formation of the Interim Government and that you have accepted the invitation.

If this means that the Viceroy has commissioned you to form the Executive Council of the Governor-General and has already agreed to accept and act upon your advice and proceed to constitute his Executive Council accordingly, it is not possible for me to accept such a position on that basis.

However, if you care to meet me on behalf of the Congress to settle the Hindu-Muslim question and resolve the serious deadlock, I shall be glad to see you today at 6 p.m.

The substance of your letter, unfortunately, has already appeared in the Press even before I received it. May I, therefore, request you to release this letter of mine also to the Press?

Yourss incerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

Letter from Pandit Nehru to Mr Jinnah, August 15

Dear Mr Jinnah,

Thank you for your letter of today's date which was delivered to me at about 1 p.m.

Nothing has transpired between me and the Viceroy except what has already been published. There is no arrangement other than what is contained in his brief offer and our acceptance. That offer, made by the Viceroy with the concurrence of the British Government, is for us to make proposals for the formation immediately of an interim government. The Executive Council of the Governor-General has not been mentioned as such. It is understood, as stated in the published correspondence between the Congress President and the Viceroy, that the Interim Government will have the greatest possible freedom in the exercise of the day-to-day administration of this country.

Since this brief offer was made and we accepted it, I have had no opportunity to meet the Viceroy or discuss the matter with him more fully. I hope to do so within the next two or three days. It was our wish, however, that I might approach you first and invite your cooperation. We are naturally anxious to form a government, which will be as representative as possible in order to deal with the urgent problems facing this country.

In your letter you state that you are unable to accept the position as it appears to you. I regret this. Perhaps, on fuller consideration of the position you would be agreeable to reconsider your decision. If so, we would welcome it. For this purpose I shall gladly see you, if you so desire.

As regards the general Hindu-Muslim question, we are always prepared to disuss this and try to find a way out. Just at present we are immediately concerned with the formation of the proviisonal government and circumstances demand that early steps

should be taken in regard to it. We hope that a coalition provisional government will itself help in the consideration and solution of our problems. While I am willing to discuss the larger question with you, I have no new suggestion to make. Perhaps you may be able to suggest a new approach.

I am prepared to come to your place at 6 p.m. this evening, or if it is more convenient to you, some time tomorrow. I am leaving Bombay on the 17th morning.

My letter to you was not sent to the Press. I made a brief statement to the Press, however, in view of repeated questions put to me by newspapermen and in order to prevent misconception, if you so desire, you can release all this correspondence to the Press.

Yours sincerely,
Jawaharlal Nehru.

Letter from Mr Jinnah to Pandit Nehru,
August 15.

Dear Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru,

I am in receipt of your letter of August 15 delivered to me at about 3.30 p.m. and I thank you for it.

I have already made my position clear in my letter dated the 15th of August sent to you this morning. But as you have given certain explanations, with some of which I must not be taken to agree, and as you desire to meet, I shall be glad to see you today at 6 p.m.

I agree with you that in order to prevent misconception in the mind of the public, our correspondence should be published and accordingly I am releasing it to the Press.

Yours sincerely,
M.A. Jinnah.

129

Correspondence on Muslim League's Entry into the interim Government between Quaid-i-Azam and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, October 1946

Letter from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr M.A. Jinnah,
October 6, 1946

I have consulted some of my colleagues about the matters discussed by us yesterday and over the possibility of rapproche-

ment between the Muslim League and the Congress. We are all agreed that nothing could be happier and better for the country than that these two organizations should meet again as before as friends having no mental reservations and bent on resolving all their differences by mutual consultation and never desiring or allowing the intervention of the British Government through the Viceroy or others of any other foreign power. We would, therefore, welcome the decision of the League to join the Interim Government for it to work as a united team on behalf of India as a whole.

The points put forward by you in our conversation yesterday were:

(1) the formula suggested to you by Gandhi,

(2) the League not being responsible for the members at present representing the Scheduled Castes and the minorities,

(3) what should be done in case any vacancy should arise among the members representing the minorities other than the Scheduled Castes,

(4) the procedure to be adopted over what may be called major communal issues, and

(5) alternating Vice-Presidentship.

Regarding No. 1, we feel that the formula is not happily worded. We do not question the purpose underlying it. We are willing, as a result of the elections, to accept the Muslim League as the authoritative representative organization of an overwhelming majority of the Muslims of India and that as such and in accordance with democratic principles they have today the unquestionable right to represent the Muslims of India, provided that for identical reasons the League recognises the Congress as the authoritative organization representing all non-Muslims and such Muslims as have thrown in their lot with the Congress. The Congress cannot agree to any restriction or limitations to be put upon it in choosing such representatives as they think proper from amongst the members of the Congress. We would suggest, therefore, that no formula is necessary and each organisation may stand on its merits.

Regarding No. 2, I am to say that the question of the League being responsible does not arise and, as you do not raise any objections to the present constitution of the Government in this respect, there is no question to be solved.

Regarding No. 3, I am to say that if any such vacancy

arises, the whole Cabinet will consider what should be done to replace the vacancy and advise the Viceroy accordingly. There can be no question of right in the matter of consultation with the League in regard to the representation of these minorities.

Regarding No. 4, your suggestion about the Federal Court is not feasible. Matters coming before the Cabinet cannot be made subject-matters of reference to court. We should thrash out all such matters amongst ourselves and bring up agreed proposals before the Cabinet. In the event of failure to reach an agreed decision, we should seek the method of arbitration of our own choice. We hope, however, that we will act with such mutual trust, forbearance and friendliness that there will be no occasion to go to such arbitration.

Regarding No. 5, it is out of the question to have any rotation in the Vice-Presidentship. We have no objection if you desire to have an additional Vice-Chairman for the Coordination Committee of the Cabinet who can also preside at such committee meetings from time to time.

I am hoping that if your Committee finally decide upon the League joining the National Cabinet, they will also decide simultaneously to join the Constituent Assembly, or recommend to your Council to this effect.

I need hardly mention that when an agreement has been reached by us it can only be varied by mutual agreement and not otherwise.

Letter from Mr M.A. Jinnah to Mr Jawaharlul Nehru, October 7, 1946

I am in receipt of your letter of 6th October, 1946, and I thank you for it. I appreciate and reciprocate your sentiments expressed in paragraph 1 of your letter.

With regard to the 2nd paragraph of your letter, point No. 1 the formula, it was accepted by Mr Gandhi and me and the meeting between us was arranged on that basis in order to negotiate and settle a few other points remaining for the purpose of reconstituting the Interim Government. The formula runs as follows:

". . . . . The Congress does not challenge and accept that the Muslim League now is the authoritative representative of an overwhelming majority of the Muslims of India. As such and in accordance with democartic principles they alone have today an unquestionable right to represent the Muslims of India. But the Congress cannot agree that any restriction or limitation should

be put upon the Congress to choose such representatives as they think proper from amongst the members of the Congress as their representative."

And now, in your letter under reply, not only you have made changes in it but you consider no formula is necessary! I regret I cannot agree to any change in the language or otherwise, as it was the agreed basis of our discussion on other points; nor can I agree with you that no formula is necessary. It was signed by Mr Gandhi and accepted by me.

As the whole basis of our talk on other matters was the formula agreed to by Mr Gandhi, I do not think we can make any further progress unless it is accepted by you as a basis upon which we can proceed to discuss other points we have already discussed orally in the course of our conversation and now I am enclosing herewith a copy of the various points put by me before you in writing.

Even the four points, excluding point No. 1 regarding the formula which I have already dealt with above, you do not agree with any one of them. I am still willing, on the basis of the formula being accepted by you, to further discuss the various points with a view to settle them in the spirit of the sentiments expressed by you in paragraph 1. I am anxious that we should come to our own settlement without undue delay.

Enclosures (*9 points*)

1. The total number of the members of the Executive Council to be 14.

2. Six nominees of the Congress will include one Scheduled Castes representative, but it must not be taken that the Muslim League has agreed to, or approves of, the selection of the Scheduled Castes representative. The ultimate responsibility in that behalf being with the Governor-General and the Viceroy.

3. That the Congress should not include in the remaining 5 members of their quota a Muslim of their choice.

4. Safeguard: That there should be a convention that on major communal issues, if the majority or Hindu or Muslim members of the Executive Council are opposed, then no decision should be taken.

5. Alternative or Rotational Vice-President should be appointed in fairness to both the major communities as it was adopted in the U.N.O. Conference.

6. The Muslim League was not consulted in the selection of the three minority representatives, i.e. Sikh, Indian Christian and Parsi and it should not be taken that the Muslim League approves of the selection that has been made. But in future, in the event of there being a vacancy owing to death, resignation or otherwise, representatives of these minorities should be chosen in consultation with the two major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress.

7. Portfolios: The most important portfolios should be equally distributed between the two major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress.

8. That the above arrangement should not be changed or modified unless both the major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress—agree.

9. The question of the settlement of the long-term plan should stand over until a better and more conducive atmosphere is created and an agreement has been reached on the points stated above and after the interim government has been re-formed and finally set up.

Letter form Mr Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr Jinnah, October 8, 1948

I received your letter of the 7th October as I was going to Baroda House to meet you there last evening. I hurriedly glanced through it and was perturbed by it as it seemed to me to be at variance with the spirit of our talk the previous day. Subsequently we discussed various points and unfortunately could not convince each other.

On my return I read through your letter more carefully and consulted some of my colleagues. They were also disturbed not only by the letter but also by the list of points attached to it. This list had not been seen or considered by us previously. It had little relevance after our talk.

We have again given earnest consideration to the whole matter and we feel that we cannot state our position more clearly than I did in my letter to you of October 6, except for some variations which I shall indicate below. I shall, therefore, refer you to that letter of mine which represents our general and specific viewpoint.

As I have told you, my colleagues and I did not accept the formula agreed to by Gandhi and you.

The meeting between you and me was not arranged so far as I was aware, on the agreed basis of that formula. We knew of it and were prepared to agree to the substance of that formula as stated to you in my letter of October 6. That formula contained a further paragraph which you have not quoted in your letter:

"It is understood that all the Ministers of the Interim Government will work as a team for the good of the whole of India and will never invoke this intervention of the Governor-General in any case."

While we still think that the formula is not happily worded, we are prepared, for the sake of the settlement we so earnestly desire, to accept the whole of it, including the paragraph left out in your letter.

In that case you will agree, I hope, that we should make our further position quite clear. It is clearly understood of course that the Congress has the right to appoint a Muslim out of its quota. Further, as I have stated in my previous letter, the Congress position in regard to the Nationalist Muslims and the smaller minorities should not be challenged by you.

In regard to points numbered 2, 3 and 4 in my letter of October 6, I have stated our position and have nothing further to add. We have gone as far as we could to meet you and we are unable to go further. I trust that you will appreciate the position.

Regarding No. 5 (the question of the Vice-President), you made a suggestion yesterday that the Vice-President and the Leader of the House (the Central Assembly) should not be the same person. In present circumstances this means that the Leader of the House should be a Muslim League member of the Cabinet. We shall agree to this.

I am writing this letter to you after full and careful consideration of all the issues involved and after consulting such of my colleagues as are here. It is in no spirit of carrying on an argument that I have written but rather to indicate to you our earnest desire to come to an agreement. We have discussed these matters sufficiently and the time has come for us to decide finally.

Letter from Mr Jinnah to Mr Jawaharlal Nehru, October 12, 1946

I received your letter dated 8th October, 1946, yesterday in reply to my letter of October 7, 1946.

I regret that you and your colleagues do not accept the formula agreed to by Mr Gandhi and me.

Mr Gandhi and I had also agreed that on that basis you and I should meet in order to negotiate and settle a few other points that remained for the purpose of reconstituting the Interim Government. Accordingly arrangements were made for our meeting on the 5th of October.

I am surprised to gather from your letter, when you say, that the meeting was not arranged, so far as you were aware, on the agreed basis of that formula. The only formula agreed upon between Mr Gandhi and me was that which was mentioned in my letter of October 7, 1946. I had not mentioned in my letter, what is referred to by you as paragraph 2, as that was one of the points among others to be further examined and discussed by you and me. This arrangement was actually put on record.

At our first meeting on the 5th of October, we discussed all the points and you informed me that you will let me know the time that will suit you to meet me the next day, but, instead of that, I received your letter of 6th October, 1946. In this letter you yourself referred to the formula as one mentioned in my letter of 7th October, and epxressed your view that the formula was not happily worded and suggested a modification by inserting a proviso as follows:

"Provided that for identical reasons the League recoginses the Congress as the authoritative organisation representing all non-Muslims and such Muslims as have thrown in their lot with the Congress."

or else, if that was not agreed to, you suggested no formula was necessary. There is no reference in your letter to what you describe as paragraph 2 as part of the agreed formula and you yourself dealt with that point quite separately in the opening paragraph of your letter which runs as follows:

"We are all agreed that nothing would be happier and better for the country than that these two organisations should meet again as before as friends having no mental reservations by mutual consultation and never desiring or allowing the intervention of the British Government through the Viceroy or others or of any other foreign power."

That, in substance, was the idea of the paragraph 2, mentioned by you, which among other matters was to be examined and discussed. I also referred to this matter in my reply stating that I appreciated and reciprocated the sentiments expressed in paragraph 1 of your letter of 6th October, 1946.

I fail to understand why you and your colleagues should have been disturbed not only by my letter of 7th October, but also by the list of points attached to it. There was nothing new in that list of points which we had not discussed the first day, as it is clear from your letter of October 6, wherein you yourself have dealt with every one of the points mentioned in the list that I sent to you. Let me take one by one the points in the list sent to you in writing:

(1) *Total number of 14.* That was not in dispute.

(2) *The Scheduled Castes' representative.* That the League must not be taken to have agreed or approved of the selection, which is referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter.

(3) *Nomination of Muslims in Congress quota.* The matter was discussed,

(4) *Safeguard.* That was discussed as is clear from point 4 in your letter.

(5) *Alternative or Rotational Vice-President.* Was discussed and is referred to as point No. 5 in your letter.

(6) *Vacancies occurring in the seats allotted to minority representatives.* This matter was discussed and is referred to by you in your letter point No. 3.

(7) *Portfolios.* The matter was discussed.

(8) *No change in the arrangements agreed to whithout the consent of both the major parties.* This was discussed and is referred to in the last paragraph of your letter.

(9) *The long-term question.* This was discussed and is mentioned in your letter, last but one paragraph.

All these points were discussed as is clear from what I have pointed out above and the list was sent to you merely as a matter of convenience and preciseness.

You state in your letter under reply that your position is the same with regard to the various matters that were discussed between us as is mentioned in your letter of the 6th of October, except for some variations which you have indicated in your letter.

Following are the variations and my reaction to them:

(1) That you would accept the formula provided paragraph 2 is included in the formula and is made a part of it.

This constitutes a fundamental departure from the original formula upon the basis of which I had agreed to have discussions with you. I cannot agree to this variation.

(2) Provided that the Muslim League does not challenge that the Congress represents the minorities and the "Nationalist Muslims" as indicated in terms of your previous letter of the 6th October, and referred to in your letter under reply.

This again is a serious departure from the agreed formula. Besides this is a mtater for the minorities concerned.

I note what you say with regard to points 2, 3 and 4 of your letter of October 6, i.e. Scheduled Castes' representative and other minorities; the position about the vacancies occurring in future in the seats allotted to the minorities and the procedure to be adopted with regard to major communal issues. Even with regard to these points there is no agreement between us.

With regard to point No. 5, Vice-Presidentship, I note what you say.

Since you have stated your position after full and careful consideration of all the issues involved and after consultation with your colleagues, I presume that it follows that this is your final stand. I deeply regret that we have failed to come to an honourable agreement of our own, satisfactory to both the parties.

Letter from Mr Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr M.A. Jinnah, Occober 13, 1946

I thank you for your letter of 12th October. In this letter there are a number of misstatements. What you have said does not fit in with my recollection of our conversations or what has taken place during the past few days. I need not, however, go into this matter now as I have been informed by the Viceroy that the Muslim League have agreed to nominate five persons on their behelf as members of Interim Government.

Letter from Mr M.A. Jinnah to Mr Jawaharlal Nehru, October 14, 1946

I am in receipt of your letter of October 13, 1946 and I thank you for it.

There is considerable speculation indulged in by the Press

and varying accounts are given of our negotiations and the termination of our discussions. I, therefore, propose to release all the correspondence passed between you and me, beginning with your letter of the 6th October and ending with your letter of 13th.

130

Correspondence regarding Muslim League's Entry into the Interim Government between the Quaid-i-Azam and the Viceroy, October 1946

Letter form Mr M.A. Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy
October 3

At the end of our last interview on October 2, 1946, it was agreed that I should finally put before you the various proposals that emerged out of our discussions, for your consideration and reply. Accordingly I am enclosing herewith the various proposals that have been formulated by me.

Enclosure

(1) The total number of the members of the Executive Council to be 14.

(2) Six nominees of the Congress will include one Scheduled Castes' representative, but it must not be taken that the Muslim League has agreed to, or approves of, the selection of the Scheduled Castes representative, the ultimate responsibility in that behalf being with the Governor-General and the Viceroy.

(3) That the Congress should not include in the remaining five members of their quota a Muslim of their choice.

(4) *Safeguard.* That there should be a convention that on major communal issues, if the majority of Hindu or Muslim members of the Executive Council are opposed, then no decision should be taken.

(5) Alternative or rotational Vice-President should be appointed in fairness to both major communities as was adopted in the U.N.O. conference.

(6) The Muslim League was not consulted in the selection of the three minority representatives, i.e. Sikh, Indian Christian and Parsi, and it should not be taken that the Muslim League approves of the selection that has been made. But in future, in

the event of there being a vacancy owing to death, resignation or otherwise, representatives of these minorities should be chosen in consultation with the two major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress.

(7) *Porifolios*. The most important portolios should be equally distributed between the two major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress.

(8) That the above arrangement should not be changed or modified unless both the major parties—the Muslim League and the Congress—agree.

(9) The question of the settlement of the long-term plan should stand over until a better and more conductive atmosphere is created and an agreement has been reached on the points stated above and after the Interim Government has been re-formed and finally set up.

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy to Mr Jinnah,
October 4

Thank you for your letter dated yesterday. My replies to your nine points are as follows:

(1) This is agreed.

(2) I note what you say and accept that the responsibility is mine.

(3) I am unable to agree to this. Each party must be equally free to nominate its own representatives.

(4) In a Coalition Government it is impossible to decide major matters of policy when one of the main parties to the coalition is strongly against a course of action proposed. My present colleagues and I are agreed that it would be fatal to allow major comunal issues to be decided by vote in the Cabinet. The efficiency and prestige of the Interim Government will depend on ensuring that differences are resolved in advance of Cabinet meetings by friendly discussions. A Coalition Government either works by a process of mutual adjustments or does not work at all.

(5) The arrangement of alternative or rotational Vice-President would present practical difficulty, and I do not consider it feasible. I will, however, arrange to nominate a Muslim League member to preside over the Cabinet in the event of the Governor-General and the Vice-President being absent.

I will also nominate a Muslim League member as Vice-Chairman of the Coordination Committee of Cabinet which is

a most important post. I am Chairman of this Committee and in the past have presided almost invariably. But I shall probably do so only on special occasions in future.

(6) I accept that both major parties would be consulted before filling a vacancy in any of these three seats.

(7) In the present conditions all the portfolios in the Cabinet are of great importance and it is a matter of opinion which are the most important. The minority representatives cannot be exculded from a share of the major portfolios and it would also be suitable to continue Mr Jagjivan Ram in the Labour portfolio. But subject to this there can be equal distribution of the most important portfolios between Congress and the Muslim League. Details would be a matter for negotiation.

(8) I agree.

(9) Since the basis for participation in the Cabinet is of course acceptance of the statement of May 16, I assume that the League Council will meet at a very early date to reconsider its Bombay resolution.

Note on the Coordination Committee of the Cabinet sent by the Viceroy.

This Committee was set up in October 1945. It absorbed the War Resources Committee and the Reconstruction Committee, and in the early stages was primarily concerned with questions affecting the transition from war to peace, and with the special short-term objects of preventing economic dislocation or distress.

The Committee is now primarily concerned with economic and industrial questions and deals with many important matters in these fields affecting more than one department of the Government of India. It deals also with matters relating to procedure of government and with the machinery for general coordination and progressing of administrative measures. Though it would be open to a Member of the Cabinet to ask that a case should be taken up in the Cabinet proper, final decisions are normally taken in the Coordination Committee. In the past the Governor-General has almost always presided but he does not propose to do so in future except on special occasions when he is particularly interested.

Letter form H.E. the Viceroy to Mr Jinnah, October 12

I confirm what I told you this evening, that the Muslim

League are at liberty to nominate any one they wish for their own quota of seats in the Cabinet, though any person proposed must of course be accepted by me and by His Majesty before being appointed.

My intention is to discuss portfolios when all the names have been received, both from the Muslim League and the Congress.

Letter from Mr Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy, October 13

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have considered the whole matter fully and I am now authorised to state that they do not approve of the basis and scheme of setting up the Interim Government which has been decided by you, presumably with the authority of His Majesty's Government.

Therefore, the Committee do not and cannot agree with your decision already taken, nor with the arrangements you have already made.

We consider and maintain that the imposition of this decision is contrary to the declaration of August 8, 1940, but since, according to your decision, we have a right to nominate five members of the Executive Council on behalf of the Muslim League, my Committee have, for various, reasons come to the conclusion that in the interests of Mussalman and other communities it will be fatal to leave the entire field of administration of the Central Government in the hands of Congress. Besides, you may be forced to have in your Interim Government Muslims who would not command the respect and confidence of Muslim India which would lead to very serious cosequences; and lastly, for other very weighty grounds and reasons, which are obvious and need not be mentioned, we have decided to nominate five on behalf of the Muslim League in terms of your broadcast, dated August 24, 1946, and your two letters to me dated October 4 and October 12, respectively, embodying clarifications and assurances.

Letter form H.E. the Viceroy to Mr Jinnah, October 13

Thank you fou your letter of today's date. I am glad to know that the Muslim League has decided to join the Interim Government. Will you please let me have the names of the five representatives, as they have to be submitted to His Majesty for approval and I should like to re-form the Government as soon as possible.

You promised yesterday that you would let me have the names today.

Letter from Mr Jinnah to H.E. the Viceroy,
October 14

I thank you for your letter of October13.

I am now sending you names of five nominees on behalf of the Muslim League as arranged in our interview of yesterday.

(1) Mr Liaquat Ali Khan, Honorary Secretary, All-India Muslim League, M.L.A. (Central).

(2) Mr I.I. Chundrigar, M.L.A. (Bombay), Leader, Muslim League Party in the Bombay Legislative Assembly and President of the Bombay Provincial Muslim League.

(3) Mr Abdur Rab Nishtar, Adocate (N.-W.F.P.), Member, Working Committee, All-India Muslim League, Committee of Action and Council.

(4) Mr Ghazanfar Ali Khan, M.L.A. (Punjab), Member, Council, All-India Muslim League, Council Provincial Muslim League and member of the Punjab Muslim League Working Committee.

(5) Mr Jogendra Nath Mandal, Advocate (Bengal), at present Minister of the Bengal Government.

Letter from H.E. the Viceroy, to Mr Jinnah,
October 25

The portfolios that I can offer the Muslim League in the Interim Government are the following:

Finance, Commerce, Posts and Air, Health and Legislative.

I should be grateful if you would let me know how you would propose that these portfolios should be distributed among the Muslim League representatives in the Cabinet.

I should like to get an announcement out tonight and to swear in the new members whom I shall warmly welcome tomorrow.

Letter from Mr Jinnah io H.E. the Viceroy,
Otober, 25

I am in receipt of your letter of October 25, at 5-30 p.m. communicating your decision regarding portfolios.

I am sorry I cannot say that it is an equitable distribution but we have discussed all the pros and cons and as you have taken your final decision, I need not go into the matter further.

I am sending you below the names of the nominees of the

Muslim League showing how these portfolios should be distributed amongst them.

Finance—Mr Liaquat Ali Khan.

Commerce—Mr I.I. Chundrigar.

Posts and Air—Mr A.R. Nishtar.

Health—Mr Ghazanfar Ali Khan.

Legislative—Mr Jogendar Nath Mandal.

131

Resolution on Muslim League's Entry into interim Government passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, 14 October, 1946

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League resolve that the following draft of the letter dated 13th October 1946, to be sent to the H.E. the Viceroy by the President of the All-India Muslim League be approved:

Dear Lord Wavell,

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have considered the whole matter fully and I am now authorised to state that they do not approve of the basis and scheme of setting up the Interim Government which has been decided by you, presumably with the authority of His Majesty's Government.

Therefore, the Committee do not and cannot agree with your decision already taken, nor with the arrangements you have already made.

We consider and maintain that the imposition of this decision is contrary to the Declaration of August 8, 1940, but since, according to your decision, we have a right to nominate five members of the Executive Council on behalf of the Muslim League, my Committee have for various reasons, come to the conclusion that in the interests of Mussalmans and other communities it will be fatal to have the entire field of administration of the Central Government in the hands of the Congress. Besides, you may be forced to have in your Interim Government Muslims who would not command the respect and confidence of Muslim India which would lead to very serious consequences; and, lastly, for other very weighty grounds and reasons, which are obvious and need be mentioned, we have decided to

nominate five on behalf of the Muslim League in terms of your broadcast dated August 24, 1946 and your two letters to me dated 4th October, 1956 and 12th October 1946 respectively, embodying clarifications and assurances.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M.A. Jinnah.

132

Statement on Interpretation of Cabinet Mission's Plan issued by His Majesty's Government, London, 6 December, 1946

The conversations held by His Majesty's Government with Pandit Nehru, Mr Jinnah, Mr Liaquat Ali Khan and Sardar Baldev Singh came to an end this evening, as Pandit Nehru and Sardar Baldev Singh are returning to India tomorrow morning.

The object of the conversations has been to obtain the participation and cooperation of all parties in the Constituent Assembly. It was not expected that any final settlement could be arrived at since the Indian representatives must consult their colleagues before any final decision is reached.

The main difficulty that has arisen has been over the interpretation of paragraphs 19 (*v*) and 19 (*viii*) of the Cabinet Mission's statement May 16th, relating to the meetings in sections, which run as follows:

Paragraph 19 (*v*)—"These sections shall proceed to settle provincial constitutions for the Provinces included in each section, and shall also decide whether any group constitution shall be set up for those Provinces and if so with what Provincial subjects the group should deal. Provinces should have power to opt out of groups in accordance with the provisions of sub-clause (*viii*) below."

Paragraph 19 (*viii*)"As soon as the new constitutional arrangements have come into operation, it shall be open to any Province to elect to come out of any group in which it has been placed. Such a decision shall be taken by the Legislature of the Province after the first general election under the new constitution."

The Cabinet Mission have throughout maintained the view that the decisions of the sections should, in the absence of agreement to the contrary, be taken by simple majority vote of the representatives in the sections. This view has been accepted

by the Muslim League, but the Congress have put forward a different view. They have asserted that the true meaning of the statement, read as a whole, is that the provinces have a right to decide both as to grouping and as to their own constitutions.

His Majesty's Government have had legal advice which confirms that the statement of May 16 means what the Cabinet Mission have always stated was their intention. This part of the statement as so interpreted must, therefore, be considered an essential part of the scheme of May 16th for enabling the Indian people to formulate a constitution which His Majesty's Government would be prepared to submit to Parliament. It should, therefore, be accepted by all parties in the Constituent Assembly.

It is, however, clear that other questions of interpretation of the statement of May 16 may arise, and His Majesty's Government hope that if the Council of the Muslim League are able to agree to participate in the Constituent Assembly they will also agree, as have the Congress, that the Federal Court should be asked to decide matters of interpretation that may be referred to them by either side and will accept such decision so that the procedure both in the Union Constituent Assembly and in the sections may accord with the Cabinet Mission's plan.

On the matter immediately in dispute His Majesty's Government urge the Congress to accept the view of the Cabinet Mission in order that the way may be open for the Muslim League to reconsider their attitude. If, in spite of this reaffirmation of the intention of the Cabinet Mission, the Constituent Assembly desires that this fundamental point should be referred for the decision of the Federal Court, such reference should be made at a very early date. It will then be reasonable that the meetings of the sections of the Constituent Assembly should be postponed until the decision of the Federal Court is known.

There has never been any prospect of success for the Constituent Assembly except upon the basis of an agreed procedure. Should a Constitution come to be framed by a Constituent Assembly in which a large section of the Indian population had not been represented, His Majesty's Government could not of course contemplate—as the Congress have stated they would not contemplate— forcing such a Constitution upon any unwilling parts of the country.

133

Statement on Transfer of Power by the British Prime Minister, Mr Attlee in the House of Commons, 20 February, 1947

I desire to make a statement on Indian policy.

1. It has long been the policy of successive British Governments to work towards the realisation of self-government in India. In pursuance of this policy an increasing measure of responsibility has been devolved on Indians and today the civil administration and the Indian Armed Forces rely to a very large extent on Indian civilians and officers. In the constitutional field the Acts of 1919 and 1935 passed by the British Parliament each represented a substantial transfer of political power. In 1940 the Coalition Government recognised the principle that Indians should themselves frame a new constitution for a fully autonomous India, and in the offer of 1942 they invited them to set up a Constituent Assembly for this purpose as soon as the war was over.

2. His Majesty's Government believe this policy to have been right and in accordance with soud democratic principles. Since they came into office, they have done their utmost to carry it forward to its fulfilment. The declaration of the Prime Minister of 15th March last which met with general approval in Parliament and the country, made it clear that it was for the Indian people themselves to choose their future status and constitution and that in the opinion of His Majesty's Government the time hade come for responsibility for the Government of India to pass into Indian hands.

3. The Cabinet Mission which was sent to India last year spent over three months in consultation with Indian leaders in order to help them to agree upon a method for determining the future constitution of India, so that the transfer of power might be smoothly and rapidly effected. It was only when it seemed clear that without some initiative from the Cabinet Mission agreement was unlikely to be reached that they put forward proposals themselves.

4. These proposals, made in May last, envisaged that the future constitution of India should be settled by a Constituent Assembly composed, in the manner suggested therein, of representatives of all communities and interests in British India and of the Indian States.

5. Since the return of the Mission an Interim Government has been set up at the Centre composed of the political leaders of the major communities exercising wide powers within the existing constitution. In all the Provinces Indian Governments responsible to Legislature are in office.

6. It is with great regret that His Majesty's Government find that there are still differences among Indian Parties which are preventing the Constituent Assembly from functioning as it was intended that it should. It is of the essence of the plan that the Assembly should be fully representative.

7. His Majesty's Government desire to hand over their responsibility to authorities established by a constitution approved by all parties in India in accordance with the Cabinet Mission's plan, but unfortunately there is at present no clear prospect that such a constitution and such authorities will emerge. The present state of uncertainty is fraught with danger and cannot be indefintiely prolonged. His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that it is their definite intention to take the necessary steps to effect the transference of power into responsible Indian hands by a date not later than June 1948.

8. This great sub-continent now containing over 400 million people has for the last century enjoyed peace and security as a part of the British Commonwealth and Empire. Continued peace and security are more than ever necessary today if the full possibilities of economic development are to be realised and a higher standard of life attained by the Indian people.

9. His Majesty's Government are anxious to hand over their responsibilities to a Government which, resting on the sure foundation of the support of the people, is capable of mintaining peace and administering India with justice and efficiency. It is, therefore, essential that all parties should sink their differences in order that they may be ready to shoulder the great responsibilities which will come upon them next year.

10. After months of hard work by the Cabinet Mission a great measure of agreement was obtained as to the method by which a constitution should be worked out. This was embodied in their statements of May last. His Majesty's Government there agreed to recommend to Parliament a constitution worked out, in accordance with the proposals made therein, by a fully representative Constituent Assembly. But if it should appear that such a constitution will not have been worked out by a fully representative Assembly before the time mentioned in paragraph 7, His Majesty's Government will have to consider to whom

the powers of the Central Government in British India should be handed over, on the due date, whether as a whole to some form of central Government for British India or in some areas to the existing Provincial Governments, or in such other way as may seem most reasonable and in the best interests of the Indian people.

11. Although the final transfer of authority may not take place until June 1948, preparatory measures must be put in hand in advance. It is important that the efficiency of the civil administration should be maintained and that the defence of India should be fully provided for. But inevitably, as the process of transfer proceeds, it will become progressively more difficult to carry out to the letter all the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935. Legislation will be introduced in due course to give effect to the final transfer of power.

12. In regard to the Indian States, as was explicitly stated by the Cabinet Mission, His Majesty's Government do not intend to hand over their powers and obligations under paramountcy to any Government of British India. It is not intended to bring paramountcy, as a system, to a conclusion earlier than the date of the final transfer of power, but it is contemplated that for the intervening period the relations of the Crown with individual States may be adjusted by agreement.

13. His Majesty's Government will negotiate agreements in regard to matters arising out of the transfer of powers with the representatives of those to whom they propose to transfer power.

14. His Majesty's Government believe that British commercial and industrial interests in India can look forward to a fair field for their enterprise under the new conditions. The commercial connection between India and the United Kingdom has been long and friendly, and will continue to be to their mutual advantage.

15. His Majesty's Government cannot conclude this statement without expressing on behalf of the people of this country their goodwill and good wishes towards the people of India as they go forward to this final stage in their achievement of self-government. It will be the wish of everyone in these islands that, notwithstanding constitutional changes, the association of the British and Indian peoples should not be brought to an end; and they will wish to continue to do all that is in their power to further the well-being of India.

134

Statement of British Government's Policy regarding the Constitutional Future of the Sub-continent, 3 June, 1947

1. On 20th February, 1947, His Majesty's Government announced their intention of transfering power in British India to Indian hands by June 1948. His Majesty's Government had hoped that it would be possible for the major parties to cooperate in the working out of the Cabinet Mission's Plan of 16th May, 1946, and evolve for India a constitution acceptable to all concerned. This hope has not been fulfilled.

2. The majority of the representatives of the provinces of Madras, Bombay, the United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces and Berar, Assam, Orissa and the North-West Frontier Province, and the representatives of Delhi, Amjer-Merwara and Coorg have already made progress in the task of evolving a new constitution. On the other hand, the Muslim League Party, including in it a majority of the representatives of Bengal, the Punjab and Sind, as also the representatives of British Baluchistan, has decided not to participate in the Constituent Assembly.

3. It has always been the desire of His Majesty's Government that power should be transferred in accordance with the wishes of the Indian people themselves. This task would have been greatly facilitated if there had been agreement among the Indian political parties. In the absence of such an agreement, the task of devising a method by which the wishes of the Indian people can be ascertained has devolved on His Majesty's Government. After full consultation with political leaders in India, His Majesty's Government have decided to adopt for this purpose the plan set out below. His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that they have no intention of attempting to frame any ultimate constitution for India; this is a matter for the Indians themselves. Nor is there anything in this plan to preclude negotiations between communities for a united India.

4. It is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to interrupt the work of the existing Constituent Assembly. Now that provision is made for certain provinces specified below, His Majesty's Government trust that, as a consequence of this announcement, the Muslim League representatives of those provinces, a majority of whose representatives are already participating in it, will now take their due share in its labours.

At the same time, it is clear that any constitution framed by this Assembly cannot apply to those parts of the country which are unwilling to accept it. His Majesty's Government are satisfied that the procedure outlined below embodies the best practical method of ascertaining the wishes of the people of such areas on the issue whether their constitution is to be framed —

(*a*) in the existing Constituent Assembly; or

(*b*) in a new and separate Constituent Assembly consisting of the representatives of those areas which decide not to participate in the existing Constituent Assembly.

When this has been done, it will be possible to determine the authority or authorities to whom power should be transferred.

5. The Provincial Legislative Assemblies of Bengal and the Punjab (excluding the European members) will therefore each be asked to meet in two parts, one representing the Muslim majority districts and the other the rest of the provinces. For the purpose of determining the population of districts, the 1941 census figures will be taken as authoritative. The Muslim majority districts in these two provinces are set out in the Appendix to this announcement.

6. The members of the two parts of each Legislative Assembly sitting separately will be empowered to vote whether or not the province should be partitioned. If a simple majority of either part decides in favour of partition, division will take place and arrangements will be made accordingly.

7. Before the question as to the partition is decided, it is desirable that the representatives of each part should know in advance which Constituent Assembly the province as a whole would join in the event of the two parts subsequently deciding to remain united. Therefore, if any member of either Legislative Assembly so demands, there shall be held a meeting of all members of the Legislative Assembly (other than Europens) at which a decision will be taken on the issue as to which Constituent Assembly the province as a whole would join if it were decided by the two parts to remain united.

8. In the event of partition being decided upon, each part of the Legislative Assembly will, on behalf of the areas they represent, decide which of the alternatives in paragraph 4 above to adopt.

9. For the immediate purpose of deciding on the issue of partition, the members of the Legislative Assemblies of Bengal and the Punjab will sit in two parts according to Muslim

majority districts (as laid down in the Appendix) and non-Muslim majority districts. This is only a preliminary step of a purely temporary nature as it is evident that for the purposes of final partition of these provinces a detailed investigation of boundary questions will be needed; and, as soon as a decision involving partition has been taken for either province, a Boundary Commission will be set up by the Governor-General, the membership and terms of reference of which will be settled in consultation with those concerned. It will be instructed to demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab on the basis of ascertaining the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims. It will also be instructed to take into account other factors. Similar instructions will be given to the Bengal Boundary Commission. Until the report of a Boundary Commission has been put into effect, the provisional boundaries indicated in the Appendix will be used.

The Legislative Assembly of Sind (excluding the European members) will at a special meeting also take its own decision on the alternatives in paragraph 4 above.

11. The position of the North-West Frontier Province is exceptional. Two of the three representatives of this province are already participating in the existing Constituent Assembly. But it is clear, in view of its geographical situation, and other considerations, that, if the whole or any part of the Punjab decides not to join the existing Constituent Assembly, it will be necessary to give the North-West Frontier Province an opportunity to reconsider its position. Accordingly, in such an event, a referendum in the North-West Frontier Province to choose which of the alternatives mentioned in paragraph 4 above they wish to adopt. The referendum will be under the aegis of the Governor-General and in consultation with the Provincial Government.

12. British Baluchistan has elected a member but he has not taken his seat in the existing Constituent Assembly. In view of its geographical situation, this province will also be given an opportunity to reconsider its position and to choose which of the alternative in paragraph 4 above to adopt. His Excellency the Governor-General is examining how this can most appropriately be done.

13. Though Assam is predominantly a non-Muslim province, the district of Sylhet which is contiguous to Bengal is predominantly Muslim. There has been a demand that, in the event of the partition of Bengal, Sylhet should be amalgamated with the Muslim part of Bengal. Accordingly, if it is decided that Bengal

should be partitioned, a referendum will be held in Sylhet district, under the aegis of the Governor-General and in consultation with the Assam Provincial Government, to decide whether the district of Sylhet should continue to form part of the Assam province or should be amalgamated with the new province of Eastern Bengal, if that province agrees. If the referendum results in favour of amalgamation with Eastern Bengal, a Boundary Commission with terms of reference similar to those for the Punjab and Bengal will be set up to demarcate the Muslim majority areas of Sylhet district and contiguous Muslim majority areas of adjoining districts which will then be transferred to Eastern Bengal. The rest of the Assam province will in any case continue to participate in the proceeding of the existing Constituent Assembly.

14. If it is decided that Bengal and the Punjab should be partitioned, it will be necessary to hold fresh elections to choose their representatives on the scale of one for every million of population according to the principle contained in the Cabinet Mission's plan of 16th May, 1946. Similar elections will also have to be held for Sylhet in the event of its being decided that this district should form part of East Bengal. The number of representatives to which each area would be entitled is as follows:

Province	General	Muslims	Sikhs	Total
Sylhet District	1	2	Nil	3
West Bengal	15	4	Nil	19
East Bengal	12	29	Nil	41
West Punjab	3	12	2	17
East Punjab	6	4	2	12

15. In accordance with the mandates given to them, the representatives of the various areas will either join the existing Constituent Assembly or form the new Constituent Assembly.

16. Negotiations will have to be initiated as soon as possible on administrative consequences of any partition that may have been decided upon:

(a) Between the representatives of the respective successor authorities about all subjects now dealt with by the Central Government, including defence, finance and communications.

(b) Between different successor authorities and His Majesty's Government for treaties in regard to matters arising out of the transfer of power.

(c) In the case of provinces that may be partitioned as to administration of all provincial subjects such as the division of assets and liabilities, the police and other services, the High Courts, provincial institutions, etc.

17. Agreements with tribes of the North-West Frontier of India will have to be negotiated by the appropriate successor authority.

18. His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that the decisions announced above relate only to British India and that their policy towards Indian States contained in the Cabinet Mission Memorandum of 12th May, 1946, remains unchanged.

19. In order that the successor authorities may have time to prepare themselves to take over power, it is important that all the above processes should be completed as quickly as possible. To avoid delay, the different provinces or parts of provinces will proceed independently as far as practicable within the conditions of this plan, the existing Constituent Assembly and the new Constituent Assembly (if formed) will proceed to frame constitutions for their respective territories; they will of course be free to frame their own rules.

20. The major political parties have repeatedly emphasized their desire that there should be the earliest possible transfer of power in India. With this desire His Majesty's Government are in full sympathy and they are willing to anticipate the date of June 1948 for the handing over of power by the setting up of an independent Indian Government or Governments at an even earlier date. Accordingly, as the most expeditious, and indeed the only practicable, way of meeting this desire His Majesty's Government propose to introduce legislation during the current session for the transfer of power this year on a Dominion Status basis to one or two successor authorities according to the decisions taken as a result of this announcement. This will be without prejudice to the right of Indian Constituent Assemblies to decide in due course whether or not the part of India in respect of which they have authority will remain within the British Commonwealth.

21. His Excellency the Governor-General will from time to time make such further announcements as may be necessary in regard to procedure or any other matters for carrying out the above arrangements.

APPENDIX

Muslim Majority Districts of Bengal and the Punjab According to the 1941 Census

1. Bengal
   - Chittagong Division
     - Chittagon
     - Noakhali
     - Tippera
   - Dacca Division
     - Bakaraganj
     - Dacca
     - Faridpur
     - Mymensingh
   - Presidency Division
     - Jessore
     - Murshidabad
     - Nadia
   - Rajshahi Division
     - Bogra
     - Dinajpur
     - Malda
     - Pabna
     - Rajshahi
     - Rangpur
2. The Punjab
   - Lahore Division
     - Gujranwala
     - Gurdaspur
     - Lahore
     - Sheikhupura
     - Sialkot
   - Rawalpindi Division
     - Attock
     - Gujrat
     - Jhelum
     - Mianwali
     - Rawalpindi
     - Shahpur
   - Multan Division
     - Dera Ghazi Khan
     - Jhang
     - Lyallpur
     - Montgomery
     - Multan
     - Muzaffargarh

135

Quaid-i-Azam's Broadcast Message, 3 June, 1947

The statement of His Majesty's Government embodying the plan for the transfer of power to the peoples of India has already been broadcast and will be released to the press to be published in India and abroad tomorrow morning. It gives the outlines of the plan for us to give it our most earnest consideration. We have to examine it coolly, calmly and dispassionately. We must remember that we have to take momentous decisions and handle grave issues facing us in the solution of the complex political problem of this great sub-continent inhabited by 400 million people. The world has no parallel for the most onerous and difficult tasks which we have to perform.

Grave responsibilities lie particularly on the shoulders of Indian leaders. Therefore, we must galvanise and concentrate all our energies to see that the transfer of power is effected in peaceful and orderly manner. I most earnestly appeal to every community and particularly to Muslim India to maintain peace and order. We must examine the plan, its letter and spirit and come to our conclusions and take our decisions. I pray to God that at this critical moment He may guide us and enable us to discharge our responsibilities in a wise and statesman-like manner having regard to the sum total of the plan as a whole.

It is clear that the plan does not meet in some important respects our point of view; and we cannot say or feel that we are satisfied or that we agree with some of the matters dealt with by the plan. It is for us now to consider whether the plan as presented to us by His majesty's Government should be accepted by us as a compromise or a settlement. On this point I do not wish to prejudge the decision of the Council of the All-India Muslim League which has been summoned to meet on Monday, 9th June; and the final decision can only be taken by that Council according to our constitution, precedents and practice. But so far as I have been able to gather on the whole the reaction in the Muslim League circles in Delhi has been hopeful. Of course, the plan has got to be very carefully examined in its pros and cons before the final decision can be taken.

I must say that I feel that the Viceroy has battled against various forces very bravely and the impression that he has left in my mind is that he was actuated by a high sense of fairness and impartiality. It is up to us now to make his task less difficult and help him as far as it is in our power in order that he may fulfil his mission of transferring power to the peoples of India in a peaceful and orderly manner.

Now, the plan that has been broadcast already makes it clear in paragraph 11 that a referendum will be made to the electorates of the Legislative Assembly in the North-West Frontier Province who will choose which of the two alternatives in paragraph 4 they wish to adopt; and the referendum will be held under the aegis of the Governor-General in consultation with the Provincial Government. Hence it is clear that the verdict and the mandate of the people of the Frontier Province will be obtained as to whether they want to join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly or the Hindustan Constituent Assembly. In these circumstances, I request the Provincial Muslim League of the Frontier to withdraw the movement of peaceful civil disobedience which they had perforce to resort to; and I call upon all the leaders of the

Muslim League and Muslims generally to organize our people to face this referendum with hope and courage and I feel confident that the people of the Frontier will give their verdict by a solid vote to join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly.

I cannot but express my appreciation of the sufferings and sacrifices made by all classes of Muslims and particularly the great part the women of the Frontier played in the fight for our civil liberties. Without apportioning blame, and this is hardly the moment to do so, I deeply sympathize with all those who have suffered, and those who died or whose properties were subjected to destruction, and I fervently hope that the Frontier will go through this referendum in a peaceful manner and it should be the anxiety of everyone to obtain a fair, free and true verdict of the people of the Frontier. Once again, I most earnestly appeal to all to maintain peace and order. Pakistan Zindabad.

137

Resolution on the 3rd June Plan passed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, Delhi, 9 June, 1947

The Council of the All-India Muslim League, after full deliberation and consideration of the statement of His Majesty's Government dated 3rd June, 1947, laying down the plan of transfer of power to the peoples of India, notes with satisfaction that the Cabinet Mission's plan of 16th May, 1946 will not be proceeded with and has been abandoned. The only course open is the partition of India as now proposed in His Majesty's Government's statement of 3rd June.

The Council of the All-India Muslim League is of the opinion that the only solution of India's problem is to divide India into two—Pakistan and Hindustan. On that basis, the Council has given its most earnest attention and consideration to His Majesty's Government's statement. The Council is of the opinion that although it cannot agree to the partition of Bengal and the Punjab, or give its consent to such partition, it has to consider His Majesty's Government's plan for the transfer of power as a whole.

The Council, therefore, hereby resolve to give full authority to the President of the All-India Muslim League, Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah, to accept the fundamental principles of the plan as a compromise and to leave it to him, with full authority, to work out all the details of the plan in an equitable and just manner

with regard to carrying out the complete division of India on the basis and fundamental principles embodied in His Majesty's Government's plan including defence, finance and communications.

The Council further empowers the President, Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah, to take all steps and decisions which may be necessary in connection with and relating to the plan.

THE END

APPENDIX I

Members of the Simla Deputation, October 1, 1906

1. H.H. the Aga Khan (Leader).
2. Shahzada Bakhtiar Shah, Calcutta.
3. Malik Umar Hayat Tiwana, Shahpur.
4. Mian Mohammad Shah Din, Bar-at-Law, Lahore.
5. Syed Sharfuddin, Bar-at-Law, Patna.
6. Nawab Syed Nawab Ali Chaudhri, Mymensingh.
7. Syed Amir Hasan Khan, Calcutta.
8. Nawab Nasir Husain Khan Khayal, Calcutta.
9. Mirza Shuja'at Ali Beg, Murshidabad.
10. Syed Ali Imam, Bar-at-Law, Patna.
11. Nawab Sarfraz Hasan Khan, Patna.
12. Ahmad Mohiuddin Saheb, Madras.
13. Moulvi Rafiuddin Ahmad, Poona.
14. Ibrahim Bhai Adamji Peerbhai, Bombay.
15. Mr Abdur Rahim, Bar-at-Law, Calcutta.
16. Allah Dad Shah Saheb, Khairpur.
17. Maulana H.M. Malak, Nagpur.
18. Khalifa Syed Mohammad Husain, Patiala.
19. Col. Abdul Majid Khan, Patiala.
20. Khwaja Yusuf Shah, Amritsar.
21. Mian Mohammad Shafi, Bar-at-Law, Lahore.
22. Shaikh Ghulam Sadiq, Amritsar.
23. Hakim Mohammad Ajmal Khan, Delhi.
24. Moulvi Ehtisham Ali, Lucknow.
25. Syed Nabiullah, Bar-at-Law, Lucknow.
26. Syed Karamat Husain, Bar-at-Law, Allahabad.
27. Syed Abdur Rauf, Bar-at-Law, Allahabad.
28. Mr Abdus Salam Khan, Moradabad.
29. Nawab Muzammilullah Khan, Aligarh.
30. Haji Mohammed Ismail Khan, Aligarh.
31. Sahebzada Aftab Ahmad Khan, Aligarh.
32. Nawab Viqarul Mulk Moulvi Mushtaq Husain, Amroha.
33. Moulvi Habibur Rahman Khan Sherwani, Aligarh.
34. Syed Sardar Ali, Bombay.
35. Nawab Mohsinul Mulk Syed Mehdi Ali, Aligarh, (Secretary).

APPENDIX II

Office-bearers of the All-India Muslim League

Presidents

1. H.H. the Agha Khan, 1907-1911.
2. Maharajah Mohammed Ali Mohammed Khan, 1912-1918.
3. Mr M.A. Jinnah, 1919-1930.
4. Mian Sir Mohammad Shafi, 1931-32.
5. Mr M.A. Jinnah, 1934—1947.

Secretaries

1. Nawab Viqarul Mulk and Nawab Mohsinul Mulk, Joint Secretaries 1906-1907.
2. Nawab Viqarul Mulk, 1907-1908.
3. Major Syed Hasan Bilgrami 1908-1910.
4. Moulvi Mohammed Aziz Mirza, 1910-1912.
5. Syed Wazir Hasan, 1912-1918.
6. Syed Zahur Ahmad 1919-1926.
7. Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlow, 1926-1929.
8. Moulvi Mohammed Yakub, 1930-1936.
9. Mr Liaquat Ali Khan, 1936-1947.

Presidents of the annual sessions

1. Sir Adamji Peerbhai, Karachi, 1907.
2. Syed Ali Imam, Amritsar, 1908.
3. Sir Ghulam Mohammed Ali, Prince of Arcot, Delhi, 1909.
4. Syed Nabiullah, Nagpur, 1910.
5. Nawab Khwaja Salimullah, Calcutta, 1911.
6. Mian Mohammad Shafi, Lucknow, 1912.
7. Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola, Agra, 1913.
8. Mr Mazharul Haq, Bombay, 1915.
9. Mr M.A. Jinnah, Lucknow, 1916.
10. Maulana Mohammad Ali, Calcutta, 1917.
11. Mr A.K. Fazlul Haq, Delhi, 1918.
12. Hakim Ajmal Khan, 1919.
13. Dr M.A. Ansari, Nagpur, 1920.
14. Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Ahmadabad, 1921.

15. Mr Ghulam Mohammed Bhurgri, Lucknow, 1923; session adjourned and reconvened at Lahore, May 1924, Mr M.A. Jinnah presided.
16. Syed Raza Ali, Bombay, 1924.
17. Sir Abdur Rahim, Aligarh, 1925.
18. Sir Abdul Qadir, Delhi, 1929.
19. Moulvi Mohammed Yakub, Calcutta, 1927.
20. Maharajah Mohammed Ali Mohammed Khan of Mahmudabad, Calcutta, 1928.
21. Dr Sir Mohammad Iqbal, Allahabad, 1930.
22. Chaudhri Mohammed Zafrullah Khan, Delhi, 1931.
23. Hafiz Hidayat Husain, Delhi, 1933.
24. Syed Wazir Hassan, Bombay, 1936.
25. Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah, Lucknow, 1937.

26.	,,	,,	Patna, 1938.
	,,	,,	Special session, Calcutta, April 1939.
27.	,,	,,	Lahore, 1940.
28.	,,	,,	Madras, 1941.
29.	,,	,,	Allahabad, 1942.
30.	,,	,,	Delhi, April, 1943.
31.	,,	,,	Karachi, December, 1943.

All-India Convention of Muslim League Legislators held in Delhi, April 1943, was presided over by Quaid-i-Azam M.A. Jinnah.

APPENDIX III

Seats won by the Muslim League in the General Elections of 1945-46

Central Assembly

Total No. of Muslim seats	Seats won
30	30

Provincial Assemblies

Province	Total No. of Muslim seats	Seats won
Assam	34	31
Bengal	119	113
Bihar	40	34
Bombay	30	30
Central Province	14	14
Madras	29	29
N.-W.F.P.	38	17
Orissa	4	4
Punjab	86	79
Sind	35	28

(In the second general election in Sind in December 1946 the League won 35 seats out of 35 seats).

United Provinces	66	54